



**Proceedings of the
69th ANNUAL CONVENTION**

NCAA

FOR 1975 WASHINGTON, D.C. / JANUARY 6-8, 1975

Proceedings
of the
69th Annual
Convention

of the
National Collegiate
Athletic Association

Sheraton-Park Hotel
Washington, D.C.
January 6-8, 1975



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

U.S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue

P.O. Box 1906

Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222

Phone 913/384-3220

April 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Register 1975

Administrative Organization	6
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working News Media ...	10

II. Proceedings of the 69th Annual Convention

Opening Session

1. Opening Remarks	24
2. Explanation of Voting Procedures	24
3. Reports of Sports and Other Committees	26
4. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	26
5. Report of the Executive Committee	28
6. Report of the Council	30
7. Report of the International Relations Committee	34
8. Report of the National Operating Committee on Standard Athletic Equipment (NOCSAE) and Related Sports Medicine Issues	44
9. Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee	45
10. Additional Announcements	47
Division I Round Table	48
Division II Round Table	51
Division III Round Table	54
General Round Table	58
Honors Luncheon	75

Business Session

11. Opening Remarks	92
12. Acceptance of the Reports of the Council and Executive Committee	92
13. Proposed Amendments	
Amateurism—Scholarships	92
Amateurism—Definition of Pay	93
Amateurism—Employment by Professionals	94
Amateurism—Professional Team Definition	94
Amateurism—Ice Hockey	94
Amateurism	94
Amateurism—Ice Hockey	94
Amateurism—Summer Expenses	95
Complimentary Tickets	95
Permissible Expenses	96
Postseason Football Contests	98
Permissible Awards	98
Eligibility for Championships	98
Outside Competition	100
Satisfactory Progress	101
Academic Standards	105
2,000 Rule	106
Conversion to 4,000	107
Transfer Rule	109
Transfers	111
Transfer Rule	111
Transfers	112

Transfer Rule	113
Continuation of Business Session	
14. Supplementary Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee	116
15. Proposed Amendments	
Amateurism—Summer Expenses	116
Transfers	117
Eligibility Rules	118
Individual Eligibility	121
Institutional Eligibility	121
Individual Eligibility	127
Five-Year Rule	127
Seasons of Competition	128
Hardship	129
Institutional Eligibility	131
Obligations of Membership	131
Eligibility	132
Obligations of Membership	132
Allied Members' Voting Privileges	132
Athletic Consortiums	132
Dues of Members	133
Resolution: Women's Intercollegiate Athletics	133
Basketball Contests	133
Institutional Eligibility	134
Penalty Structure	136
Transfer of Membership	139
Change of Division	139
Membership Divisions	140
Division III Criteria	141
Obligations of Membership—Legal Costs	141
Continuation of Business Session	
16. Proposed Amendments	
Resolution: Women's Intercollegiate Athletics	144
Restitution	150
Penalty Structure	150
Institutional Eligibility	150
Personnel	152
Obligations of Membership	152
Institutional Hearings	154
Football Rules Committee	154
Resolution: Enforcement Procedures	155
Enforcement Policy	155
Maximum Awards	156
Countable Players	157
Initial Awards—Football and Basketball	158
Multiple Sports Participants	159
Basketball Contests	160
Maximum Awards	161
Financial Aid Definition	163
Financial Aid—Employment	163
Recruiting Benefits	163
Recruiting Visitations	165
Recruiting Contacts	165

Recruiting—Transportation	168
Tryout Exceptions	169
High School All-Star Games	170
Rules Committees	170
Television Committee	170
Ice Hockey Committee	171
Legislative Committee	171
Committees	171
Nominating Committee	172
Committee on Committees	172
Ethical Conduct	172
Advertising	172
Resolution: Television Plan	173
Drug Education Committee	173
Limitation on Contracts	174
Traditional Fall Season	174
Out-of-Season Practice	174
Postseason Football Contests	175
Permissible Practice	175
Division III Championships	175
Amendments	175
Amendments to Amendments	176
Ineligible Participants	176
Executive Regulations	176
Ineligible Participants	176
Championship Eligibility	177
National Collegiate Basketball Championship	178
Resolution: Postseason Football Games	178
Resolution: Basketball Hall of Fame	178
Resolution: Tickets	178
17. Boston University Appeal	180
18. Report of the Committee on Committees	181
19. Report of the Nominating Committee	182

III. Appendices

Appendix A: Legislative Proposals	A- 1
Appendix B: Executive Regulations	A-64
Appendix C: Resolution	A-68
Appendix D: Amendments to Amendments and Other Proposals	A-69
Appendix E: Convention Committees	A-85
Appendix F: Past and Present Officers of the NCAA	A-87
Appendix G: NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1977	A-88

1975 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

NCAA Officers

President

JOHN A. FUZAK

Associate Dean, School for Advanced Studies, College of Education
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Secretary-Treasurer

STANLEY J. MARSHALL, Director of Athletics
Director, Health Physical Education and Recreation
South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota 57006

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS, U.S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue
P.O. Box 1906, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222

The Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Eight members of the Council are the eight district vice-presidents, each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately reelected for one additional term. Eight vice-presidents-at-large are elected for terms of three years and may not be reelected until three years have elapsed.

Term Expires

- District 1 Vice-President—Ross H. Smith Jan. 1976
Professor; Director of Athletics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Box D, MIT Station, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
- District 2 Vice-President—Raymond J. Whispell Jan. 1977
Professor of Physical Education, Director of Athletics
Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania 18104
- District 3 Vice-President—Ralph E. Fadum Jan. 1976
Dean, School of Engineering, 229 Riddick Bldg., Box 5518
North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N.C. 27607
- District 4 Vice-President—Edwin L. Saxer Jan. 1977
Professor of Civil Engineering
University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606
- District 5 Vice-President—James Frank Jan. 1977
President
Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
- District 6 Vice-President—J. Neils Thompson Jan. 1977
Professor of Civil Engineering, Balcones Research Center,
Route 4, Box 189
University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78757

1975 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Council (Continued)

- District 7 Vice-President—Harry E. Troxell Jan. 1976
Professor of Wood Science and Technology
Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
- District 8 Vice-President—Edward S. Betz Jan. 1977
Dean, All-University Programs
University of the Pacific, Stockton, California 95211
- Vice-President-at-Large—Ernest C. Casale Jan. 1978
Director of Athletics; Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
- Vice-President-at-Large—John R. Eiler Jan. 1978
Director of Athletics; Professor of Physical Education
East Stroudsburg State College, East Stroudsburg, Pa. 18301
- Vice-President-at-Large—James E. Hawkins Jan. 1977
Professor; Director of Athletics
Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia 31030
- Vice-President-at-Large—Hubert Heitman Jan. 1978
Academic Assistant, Academic Affairs, 517 Mark Hall
University of California, Davis, California 95616
- Vice-President-at-Large—Franklin A. Lindeburg Jan. 1977
Director of Athletics
University of California, Riverside, California 92502
- Vice-President-at-Large—J. William Orwig Jan. 1976
Professor of Health, Physical Education and Recreation;
Director of Athletics
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401
- Vice-President-at-Large—Robert M. Strimer Jan. 1978
Director of Athletics; Chrm., Department of Physical Education
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio 43015
- Vice-President-at-Large—John W. Winkin Jan. 1977
Administrative Assistant to the Director of Athletics
University of Maine, Orono, Maine 04473

1975 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Executive Committee

The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining eight members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year. Date of first election is shown in parentheses.

Stan Bates (Jan. 1970)

Commissioner, Western Athletic Conference
1515 Cleveland Place, Denver, Colorado 80202

William M. Bell (Jan. 1974)

Professor; Director of Athletics; Assistant to the Chancellor
Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301

Wayne Duke (April 1969)

Commissioner, Big Ten Conference
1111 Plaza Drive, Schaumburg, Illinois 60172

Earl M. Ramer (Jan. 1973)

Professor of Education, 13 Henson Hall
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Polk F. Robison (Jan. 1970)

Athletic Administrator of Finance and Development
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409

Edgar A. Sherman (Jan. 1974)

Chairman, Health and Physical Education; Director of Athletics
Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio 43762

Edward S. Steitz (Jan. 1974)

Professor; Director of Athletics
Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts 01109

David Swank (Jan. 1975)

Professor of Law; Director, Clinical Legal Education
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73069

National Office

General Administration

Walter Byers, *Executive Director*

Louis J. Spry, *Controller*

James H. Wilkinson, *Assistant Executive Director*

Marjorie Fieber, *Business Manager*

Events

Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Assistant Executive Director*

Jerry A. Miles, *Director of Events*

Ralph McFillen, *Assistant Director of Events*

Dennis L. Poppe, *Assistant Director of Events*

Enforcement

Warren S. Brown, *Assistant Executive Director*

David Berst, *Executive Assistant*

William B. Hunt, *Executive Assistant*

James E. Delany, *Enforcement Representative*

Douglas W. Dunlop, *Enforcement Representative*

Fannie B. Vaughan, *Administrative Assistant*

NCAA Publishing Service

Ted C. Tow, *Director*

Jonathan Clark, *Assistant Director*

C. Eugene Jacobs, *Assistant Director*

Maxine Alejos, *Circulation Manager*

Sheila M. Flanagan, *Publications Editor*

Wallace Renfro, *Production Manager*

Public Relations

Thomas C. Hansen, *Assistant Executive Director*

David E. Cawood, *Director of Public Relations*

Grayle W. Howlett, *Director of Marketing*

Dave R. Daniel, *Editor, NCAA News*

Shirley Whitacre, *Administrative Assistant*

Service Bureau (NCSS)

John T. Waters, *Director*

Jim Van Valkenburg, *Associate Director*

Steve Boda, *Research*

Chris Erles, *Compilations*

Jerry Klein, *Compilations*

Ron Schwartz, *News Film*

Jules Winn, *Compilations*

NCSS address until July 1, 1975: 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017; telephone 212/725-5910. After July 1, 1975: P. O. Box 1906, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222; telephone 913/384-3220.

Film Service

Richard S. Snider, *Director*

NCAA OFFICIAL FILMS

P. O. Box 2726

Wichita, Kansas 67201

Telephone 316/267-2828

SIXTY-NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District One

American International College: Milton J. Piepul
Amherst College: Ben F. McCabe
Assumption College: Andrew Laska
Bates College: Robert W. Hatch
Bentley College: Albert Harrington
Boston College: William J. Flynn, Rev. David Carroll
Boston State College: James P. Sullivan
Boston University: Richard Gibney, John G. Fabiano
Bowdoin College: Edmund L. Coombs
Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis
Bridgeport, University of: Francis Poisson
Bridgewater State College: Harry Lehmann
Brown University: Ferdinand A. Geiger, Robert A. Seiple
Central Connecticut State College: Lowell Lukas, William M. Moore
Clark University: Russ Granger
Colby College: Richard McGee
Connecticut, University of: John L. Toner
Dartmouth College: Seaver Peters, Alden H. Burnham
Eastern Connecticut State College: William Holowaty
Fairfield University: C. Donald Cook
Harvard University: Baaron B. Pittenger
Hawthorne College: Donald Thibeault
Holy Cross College: Ronald S. Perry
Keene State College: Leo F. Redfern
Lowell Technological Institute: A. James Oliver
Maine, University of, Gorham: Richard A. Costello
Maine, University of, Orono: Harold S. Westerman, John W. Winkin
Maine Maritime Academy: Verge Forbes
Massachusetts, University of: Frank McInerney, David C. Bischoff, Robert W. O'Connell
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ross H. Smith
Merrimack College: Frank T. Monahan
Middlebury College: Richard W. Colman Jr.
New Hampshire, University of: Andrew T. Mooradian
New Haven, University of: Joseph A. Machnik
Nichols College: Hal Chalmers
North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
Northeastern University: Herbert W. Gallagher, Joseph P. Zabilski
Norwich University: R. B. Priestley
Plymouth State College: Joe Clark
Providence College: Very Rev. Raymond B. St. George

Quinnipiac College: Burt Kahn
Rhode Island, University of: Maurice Zarchen
Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
Southern Connecticut State College: Ray DeFrancesco
Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz
Trinity College: Karl Kurth Jr.
Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo
U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Capt. Otto Graham
Vermont, University of: Denis E. Lambert, C. Irving Meeker
Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell
Westfield State College: Paul Bogan
Williams College: Robert R. Peck
Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert W. Pritchard
Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin
Yale University: DeLaney Kiphuth, James G. Holgate

District Two

Albany, State University of New York: Joseph Garcia
Alfred University: Paul F. Powers
Allegheny College: Harold N. McElhaney
American University: Robert H. Frailey
Bernard M. Baruch College: Alfred R. Peredo
Bethany College: Bob Goin
Binghamton, State University of New York: Robert D. Kreidler
Bloomsburg State College: Conrad A. Bautz, James H. McCormick
Brockport, State University College: Albert W. Brown, David M. Hutter
Brooklyn College: Charles Tobey
Bucknell University: Robert A. Latour
Buffalo, State University College: Howard B. MacAdam
Buffalo, State University of New York: Howard Tieckelmann, Harry Fritz, Edwin D. Muto
C. W. Post College: William Ashley
California (Pa.) State College: Paul E. Ross
Canisius College: Daniel P. Starr
Cheyney State College: Edwin W. Lawrence
Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli
Clarkson College of Technology: F. William Fiesinger
Colgate University: Robert C. Deming
Columbia University: Al Paul, Dick Sakala
Cornell University: Robert J. Kane
Cortland, State University College: Francis J. Woods
Delaware, University of: Arnold M. Clark, David M. Nelson, Scotty Duncan
Delaware State College: James H. Williams
Delaware Valley College: John Silan
Dickinson College: David B. Eavenson
District of Columbia Teachers College: Frank A. Solva
Drexel University: John Semanik
Duquesne University: John M. Manning
East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler
Edinboro State College: Allan W. Hall
Elizabethtown College: John M. Tulley
Elmira College: Paul H. Brand

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Robert T. Shields
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Harvey D. Woods,
 Paul B. Devlin
 Fordham University: Peter A. Carlesimo
 Franklin and Marshall College: William A. Marshall
 Fredonia, State University College: Everett J. Phillips
 Gannon College: Howard Elwell
 Geneseo, State University College: Robert W. MacVittie,
 Robert F. Riedel
 George Washington University: Edward A. Caress, Robert K. Faris,
 Walton Smith
 Georgetown University: Francis X. Rienzo, Rev. Edward Glynn,
 Stephen P. Stageberg
 Gettysburg College: Eugene M. Haas
 Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia, Maurice G. Verbeke
 Grove City College: R. Jack Behringer
 Hamilton College: Eugene M. Long
 Hampton Institute: Sylvius S. Moore, Samuel E. Massenburg
 Haverford College: Dana W. Swan
 Herbert H. Lehman College: Michael M. Fleischer, Ted Hurwitz
 Hobart College: William C. Stiles
 Hofstra University: Robert M. Getchell
 Howard University: Sondra L. Norrell, Leo F. Miles
 Hunter College: Anthony Scolnick
 Indiana (Pa.) University: Herman L. Sledzik, John Chellman
 Iona College: James McDermott
 Ithaca College: Philip J. Butterfield
 Jersey City State College: Tom M. Gerrity
 Juniata College: Walter Nadzak Jr.
 Kean College: Hawley C. Waterman
 King's College: Edward F. Donohue
 Kutztown State College: Winton C. Evans
 Lafayette College: Olav B. Kollevoll
 LaSalle College: John J. Conboy
 Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby, Preston Parr
 LeMoyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.
 Lock Haven State College: Stanley E. Daley
 Long Island University: Jerry Donner
 Lycoming College: David G. Busey
 Manhattan College: Kenneth A. Norton
 Mansfield State College: Charles A. Griffin
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Leon N. Coursey
 Millersville State College: Lawrence A. McDermott
 Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi
 Moravian College: Rocco J. Calvo
 Morgan State College: Earl Banks, Doddanna N. Rajanna,
 John H. Branch Jr., Walter Fisher
 Muhlenberg College: Raymond J. Whispell
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: Robert F. Swanson
 New York, City College of: Robert F. Greene, David J. Halberstam
 New York Institute of Technology: Henry Jacobsohn
 New York Maritime College: Roger Reinhart
 New York University: Daniel E. Quilty

Niagara University: Rev. John W. Carven
 Oswego, State University College: John V. Glinski
 Pace University: Peter X. Finnerty
 Pennsylvania, University of: Fred A. Shabel, Alice Emerson,
 Richard L. Corrigan
 Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Edward M. Czekaj,
 Robert J. Scannell, James I. Tarman, John M. Morris
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Sciences: Harry Pure
 Pittsburgh, University of: Harry J. Werner, Walt Cummins,
 Casimir J. Myslinski, Albert E. Smith, Herbert C. Smith
 Plattsburgh, State University College: Joseph C. Jastrab,
 Ernest P. Rangazas
 Potsdam, State University College: Sam Molnar
 Princeton University: Royce N. Flippin Jr.
 Queens College: Robert J. Tierney, Charles L. Crawford
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Richard S. Lyon, Robert F. Ducatte
 Rider College: Francis Pittaro
 Rochester, University of: David R. Ocorr
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis A. Alexander Jr.
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger,
 Malcom G. McLaren, Donald B. Heilman
 St. Bonaventure University: Lawrence J. Weise
 St. Francis College (NY): John Clifford
 St. John's University (NY): John W. Kaiser, John F. Geis
 St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon
 St. Peter's College: John B. Wilson
 Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
 Seton Hall University: Richard J. Regan, Thomas G. Fahy,
 Thomas Murphy
 Shippensburg State College: John E. Hubley, John W. Bay
 Slippery Rock State College: Robert E. Raymond, Gene Boyer
 Southampton College: James Colclough
 Stony Brook, State University College: Richard Smoliak
 Swarthmore College: Willis J. Stetson
 Syracuse University: Lester Dye, Ronald J. Oyer,
 Joseph G. Szombathy
 Temple University: Ernest C. Casale
 Thiel College: James L. McCullough
 Trenton State College: Roy W. Van Ness
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Capt. William T. Lai
 U.S. Military Academy: Brig. Gen. Frederick A. Smith Jr.,
 Col. William J. Schuder
 U.S. Naval Academy: Capt. J. O. Coppedge
 Union College: R. Bruce Allison
 Ursinus College: Everett M. Bailey
 Villanova University: Ted Aceto, Arthur L. Mahan
 Wagner College: Larry J. Geraciotti
 Washington and Jefferson College: Paul L. Reardon
 West Chester State College: Robert W. Reese, Dennis Bell,
 Charles G. Mayo
 West Virginia University: Joseph Newhouse, Leland E. Byrd,
 J. Edward Shockey
 Widener College: George A. Hansell

Wilkes College: John G. Reese
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason
 York College (Pa.): Jack C. Jaquet
 York College (N.Y.): Stuart Bailin

District Three

Alabama, University of: Charley Scott, Sam D. Bailey, Jeff Coleman,
 Charles J. Thornton
 Albany State College: Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.
 Appalachian State University: C. H. Gilstrap, James F. Jones
 Auburn University: Lee R. Hayley
 Augusta College: George A. Christenberry
 Austin Peay State University: George Fisher
 Baptist College: W. Howard Bagwell
 Bowie State College: A. C. Jordan, Joe Wilder, Clarence R. Thomas
 Bridgewater College: James A. Reedy
 Catholic University: J. Brian McCall, George Wanko
 Centre College: Herbert W. McGuire
 Christopher Newport College: R. Bev Vaughan Jr.
 Citadel: Col. John E. Burrows, Edward L. Teague
 Clemson University: Kenneth N. Vickery, H. C. McLellan,
 Ralph Floyd
 Davidson College: John M. Bevan, Thomas A. Cartmill
 Delta State University: Horace L. McCool
 Duke University: Allan Kornberg, Carl James, Tom Butters,
 Richard Giannini
 East Carolina University: C. G. Moore, Clarence Stasavich,
 William E. Cain
 East Tennessee State University: Solon Gentry, J. Madison Brooks
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs
 Elizabeth City State University: Robert L. Vaughan
 Fayetteville State University: William M. Bell
 Federal City College: Samuel E. Barnes, Earl M. Richards
 Fisk University: Herbert B. Thompson
 Florida, University of: Mandell Glicksberg, S. Ray Graves
 Florida A&M University: Hansel E. Tookes
 Florida State University: Richard M. Baker Jr., John Bridgers
 Florida Technological University: John W. Powell
 Fort Valley State College: James E. Hawkins
 Furman University: Francis W. Bonner
 George Mason University: Raymond H. Spuhler, John Linn
 Georgia, University of: Joel Eaves, J. Reid Parker
 Georgia Institute of Technology: William M. Sangster,
 John McKenna, John H. O'Neill Jr.
 Georgia Southern College: Pope A. Duncan, Ronald G. Polk,
 William L. Cook
 Georgia State University: David C. Ewert
 Greensboro College: William S. Ariail, Milton E. Reece
 Jacksonville University: Robert H. Spiro, Judson B. Harris Jr.
 Johns Hopkins University: Robert H. Scott
 Kentucky, University of: Harry C. Lancaster, Cliff Hagan,
 William L. Matthews
 Kentucky State University: William Exum
 Livingstone College: Fred D. Ponder

Louisiana State University: Carl Maddox, J. B. Frye Jr.
 Loyola College: Kevin J. Kavanagh
 Lynchburg College: William H. Shellenberger, James C. Fox
 Madison College: William E. Callahan
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore: James C. Mohr,
 E. Richard Watts Jr., Jack Burk
 Maryland, University of, College Park: John E. Faber,
 James H. Kehoe Jr.
 Maryville College: Jim Jordan
 Memphis State University: Ford Haynes, Billy J. Murphy,
 R. Eugene Smith, Billy Mac Jones, John D. Jones, Chester J. Doll
 Mercer University: Barry Myers
 Methodist College: Gene Clayton, Jerry Huckabee
 Miami, University of: John A. Harrison, Peter R. Elliott,
 Harry C. Mallios
 Middle Tennessee State University: Charles M. Murphy
 Miles College: T. J. Knox
 Mississippi, University of: Porter L. Fortune Jr., Richard E. Keye,
 John H. Vaught, Warner Alford, E. C. Cooper
 Mississippi College: John M. Williams, John W. Legg
 Mississippi State University: Charles N. Shira
 Morehead State University: G. E. Moran Jr.
 Morehouse College: Arthur J. McAfee Jr.
 Morris Brown College: M. J. Powell Jr.
 Mount Saint Mary's College: James G. Deegan
 Nicholls State University: Raymond E. Didier
 Norfolk State College: William L. Archie
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Gerald A. Barrett,
 Homer C. Rice, William W. Cobey Jr.
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Thomas C. Turner,
 Larry C. Bostian
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James R. Swiggett
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: W. J. Brooks
 North Carolina A&T State University: Calvin C. Irvin
 North Carolina Central University: James W. Younge,
 Albert N. Whiting, James R. Butts
 North Carolina State University: Robert S. Bryan, Willis R. Casey,
 Frank Weedon, Ralph E. Fadum
 North Carolina Wesleyan College: Donald L. Scalf, Raymond E. Bauer
 Northeast Louisiana University: Marcus B. Mapp, Bill Beall
 Northwestern Louisiana State University: George E. Doherty,
 Arnold R. Kilpatrick, Robert A. Alost
 Old Dominion University: James Jarrett
 Richmond, University of: Clyde W. Biggers, Richard C. Chewning,
 Chuck Boone, Frank Soden
 Roanoke College: Thomas Martin, Edmond J. Seifried
 Rollins College: Edward F. Danowitz
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Julian L. Smith
 St. Paul's College: Joseph E. Thompson
 Salisbury State College: Deane E. Deshon
 Samford University: H. Evan Zeiger
 South, University of the: Walter D. Bryant Jr.
 South Alabama, University of: Melvin A. Lucas

South Carolina, University of: William F. Putnam,
 John F. Willenborg, Paul F. Dietzel, Harold B. Hagan
 South Carolina State College: Milton D. Hunter
 South Florida, University of: Richard T. Bowers
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Pat Kenelly
 Southern Mississippi, University of: J. Lloyd Milam, Roland H. Dale
 Southern University: Artis M. Davenport
 Southwestern College: William R. Maybry
 Tampa, University of: Sam M. Bailey
 Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: James E. Drinnon Jr.,
 Harold B. Wilkes, Charles M. Temple
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Earl M. Ramer,
 George R. Woodruff, Haywood Harris
 Tennessee, University of, Martin: Robert L. Carroll
 Tennessee State University: George W. Cox, Howard C. Gentry
 Tennessee Technological University: Don Wade, Bill Branch
 Towson State College: Thomas O. Meinhardt
 Tulane University: Hugh F. Rankin, Rix N. Yard
 Valdosta State College: James D. Daniels, William C. Grant
 Vanderbilt University: R. R. Purdy, G. Clayton Stapleton,
 Rollin Barnes
 Virginia, University of: D. Alan Williams, Eugene F. Corrigan
 Virginia Military Institute: Col. John G. Barrett, Tom Joynes
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Wilson B. Bell, W. B. Matthews,
 Frank O. Moseley, Jimmy Sharpe, S. K. Cassell
 Virginia State College: Claud Flythe, William M. Bennett,
 Alphonso McCain, Jim Bryan
 Wake Forest University: John W. Sawyer, Gene E. Hooks
 Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry,
 George W. Ray III
 Washington College: Edward L. Athey
 Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Robert Waters
 Western Maryland College: Richard A. Clower
 William and Mary, College of: Bernard L. Carnevale

District Four

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson
 Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Lee J. Tressel
 Ball State University: George E. Swafford, Raymond A. Louthen,
 John Reno, John J. Pruis
 Beloit College: Robert G. Nicholls
 Bowling Green State University: Hollis A. Moore, Richard A. Young,
 Carl W. Hallberg, Jim Krone, Don A. Cunningham, James E. Hof
 Butler University: Tom M. Warner
 Calvin College: David B. Tuuk
 Case Western Reserve University: J. William Grice
 Central Michigan University: Lester H. Serier, Theodore Kjolhede
 Central State University: Norman E. Ward Sr.
 Chicago, University of: Walter L. Hass
 Chicago State University: Dorothy Richey
 Cincinnati, University of: William R. Nester, Hindman Wall
 Cleveland State University: Robert F. Busbey
 Dayton, University of: Dale N. Foster

Denison University: LeRoy G. Seils
 DePauw University: Robert D. Loring, Thomas A. Mont
 Eastern Illinois University: Mike Mullally, Ron Paap
 Eastern Michigan University: George W. Linn, John Fountain
 Elmhurst College: James R. Cunningham
 Evansville, University of: Ralph H. Coleman
 Heidelberg College: Jim Getz
 Hope College: Gordon M. Brewer
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: W. A. Ferguson,
 Cecil N. Coleman, Richard P. Tamburo
 Illinois, University of, Chicago, Chicago Circle: William Roetzheim,
 Edward L. Deam
 Illinois State University: Twyman Jones, Warren H. P. Schmakiel
 Indiana Central College: Robert M. Brooker, William A. Bright
 Indiana State University, Terre Haute: John C. Jessell,
 Robert L. King, Jerry Huntsman
 Indiana University: Daniel W. Miller, J. William Orwig,
 Chris C. Dal Sasso, Bob Hicks, Bob Dro
 Iowa, University of: Robert F. Ray, Chalmers W. Elliott,
 John J. Jermier
 John Carroll University: James M. Lavin
 Kalamazoo College: Rolla L. Anderson
 Kent State University: Gerald Ridinger, Milo R. Lude
 Kenyon College: John Ward, Philip J. Morse
 Lake Superior State College: Ronald R. Cooper
 Lawrence University: Ronald D. Roberts
 MacMurray College: William L. Wall
 Marquette University: William G. Murphy
 Marshall University: Harold L. Willey, Robert B. Hayes,
 Joseph H. McMullen, Edward M. Starling
 Miami University: Charles Heimsch, Richard G. Shrider
 Michigan, University of: Marcus L. Plant, Donald B. Canham,
 Don Lund
 Michigan State University: John A. Fuzak, J. Burt Smith
 Michigan Technological University: K. Ross Johnson, Ted Kearly
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Ralph A. Romano
 Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis: Merle K. Loken,
 Paul R. Giel, Robert J. Geary
 Mount Union College: Jackson W. Rafeld
 Muskingum College: Edgar A. Sherman, Rudy Gerlach
 Northern Illinois University: Richard J. Nelson, Emory G. Evans,
 Robert J. Brigham
 Northern Michigan University: Thomas L. Knauss, Gil Canale
 Northwestern University: Leon A. Bosch, John Pont, Robert H. Kurz
 Notre Dame, University of: Edward W. Krause,
 Rev. Edmund P. Joyce
 Oakland University: Glenn A. Jackson, Corey Van Fleet
 Ohio Northern University: Marvin V. English
 Ohio State University: Roy A. Larmee, J. Edward Weaver,
 Hugh Hindman, Richard Armitage
 Ohio University: Fred Picard, William D. Rohr
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Robert M. Strimer
 Otterbein College: Robert Agler

Purdue University: Roy L. Whistler, George S. King Jr., William E. Newell
 Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology: Bob Bergman
 St. Joseph's College (Ind.): Richard F. Scharf
 St. Thomas, College of: Frank Mach
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: W. D. Klimstra, Douglas W. Weaver
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Robert Guelker
 Toledo, University of: Edwin L. Saxer, Charles Snyder, Vernon Smith
 Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig, Emory G. Bauer
 Wabash College: Robert L. Henry, Max E. Servies
 Wayne State University: Joel G. Mason, Chalmer G. Hixson
 Western Illinois University: Gil Peterson, James E. McKinney
 Western Michigan University: Leo C. Vander Beek, Robert W. Hannah, Joseph T. Hoy, F. William Doolittle
 Wheaton College: Jack Swartz
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Bruce A. Grimes
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Frank J. Remington, Otto Breitenbach
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Ernest Spaight, Thomas Rosandich, George E. Uhlig
 Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Wayne E. Dannehl
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Charles E. Morphew
 Wittenberg University: Everett H. Bush, F. Davis Maurer
 Wooster, College of: Robert M. Bruce
 Wright State University: Gordon L. Wise
 Youngstown State University: Paul Amodio

District Five

Augustana College: Ralph Starenko
 Bradley University: Orville Nothdurft, Charles K. Orsborn
 Central College: Ronald Schipper, Kenneth J. Weller
 Central Missouri State University: Floyd Walker
 Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Edwin B. Crowder
 Cornell College: Paul M. Maaske
 Creighton University: Rev. Michael P. Sheridan
 Drake University: Stuart C. Tiedeman, Robert D. Karnes
 Grinnell College: John A. Pfitsch
 Iowa State University: John P. Mahlstede, Louis G. McCullough
 Kansas, University of: Clyde L. Walker, Jerry Waugh, J. Hammond McNish
 Kansas State University: C. Clyde Jones, Ernie D. Barrett, Bradley Rothermel
 Lincoln University: Dwight T. Reed, James Frank
 Louisville, University of: Carl E. Abner, Dave Hart
 Mankato State College: James R. Otto
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Henry T. Lowe, Mel R. Sheehan
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Lawrence D. Friedman
 Morningside College: L. A. Brockman
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Keith L. Broman, Don Bryant
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Don Leahy
 New Mexico State University: Carl R. Hall, Keith Colson
 North Dakota, University of: Leonard R. Marti
 North Dakota State University: A. L. Sponberg

North Texas State University: William A. Miller, Hayden Fry, DeWitt T. Weaver
 Northeast Missouri State University: Kenneth L. Gardner
 Northern Iowa, University of: Stan Sheriff
 Oklahoma, University of: David Swank
 Oklahoma City University: Lloyd K. Musselman
 Oklahoma State University: Raymond E. Chapel, Floyd Gass
 Oral Roberts University: Bob Vanatta, Bob Brooks
 St. Louis University: Lawrence K. Albus
 South Dakota, University of: Carl R. Miller
 South Dakota State University: David F. Pearson, Stanley J. Marshall
 Southeast Missouri State University: John Schneider
 Southwest Missouri State University: Aldo A. Sebben, R. K. Gilmore
 Tulsa, University of: John P. Dratz, F. A. Dry
 West Texas State University: Jack M. Bullock, Gene Mayfield
 Wichita State University: Robert M. Holmer, Ted C. Bredehoff

District Six

Alcorn State University: Marino H. Casem, James A. Brooks, Norris A. Edney
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: Albert M. Witte, Frank Broyles, Fred Vescolani
 Arkansas, University of, Pine Bluff: Lennis V. Coleman
 Arkansas State University: Sam R. Gennuso
 Baylor University: Edwin D. Horner, Jack Patterson
 Bishop College: Shannon D. Little
 Centenary College: Robert D. Deufel
 Grambling State University: Edward G. Robinson, Julian Spence
 Hardin-Simmons University: Elwin L. Skiles
 Houston, University of: Harry H. Fouke
 Houston Baptist University: William B. Crittenden, Ed S. Billings
 Jackson State University: Tellis B. Ellis
 Lamar University: James B. Higgins Jr., Ed Eveland
 Louisiana Tech University: Harold J. Smolinski
 McNeese State University: Louis P. Reily, Jack V. Doland
 Mississippi Valley State University: Silas Peyton, Davis Weathersby
 Pan American University: John W. Hook
 Prairie View State University: Hoover J. Wright
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, A. M. Bale
 Southern Methodist University: Douglas Jackson, Harold Jeskey, Dick Davis, Jim L. Brock
 Southern University: Claude T. Paxton
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Duane Blumberg, Toby Warren
 Texas University of, Austin: J. Neils Thompson, William G. Wolfe
 Texas A&M University: Charles H. Samson Jr., Emory Bellard, Marvin Tate
 Texas Christian University: Kenneth Herrick, Frank Winddeger, W. Earl Waldrof
 Texas Southern University: Roderick Paige
 Texas Tech University: Grover E. Murray, John Cobb, J. T. King, Polk F. Robison

District Seven

Arizona, University of: David Strack, Louis A. Myers, W. S. Belknap

Arizona State University: V. Alonzo Metcalf, Fred L. Miller
 Boise State University: Robert Cornwell, Lyle H. Smith
 Brigham Young University: Milton F. Hartvigsen, Stanley H. Watts
 Colorado School of Mines: Fritz S. Brennecke, John A. Hogan
 Colorado State University: Jack O'Leary, Harry E. Troxell
 Denver, University of: David E. Fletcher
 Idaho, University of: Leon G. Green, Roland O. Byers
 Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Milton W. Holt,
 William E. Davis
 Montana, University of: Richard C. Bowers, Jack Swarthout
 Montana State University: Harry G. Cockrum, Tom Parac
 New Mexico, University of: Jose E. Martinez, Lavon McDonald,
 Ike Singer
 Northern Arizona University: Lyle L. Mullens, T. H. Anderson,
 J. Lawrence Walkup
 Northern Colorado, University of: Don Chaloupka, Joe Lindahl
 Regis College: Clarence H. Kellogg
 Texas, University of, El Paso: Jim Bowden, Richard W. Burns
 U.S. Air Force Academy: Col. Philip J. Erdle, Col. Frank E. Merritt
 Utah, University of: Robert W. Swenson, James R. Jack
 Utah State University: Norman B. Jones, Ladell Andersen
 Weber State College: Dale L. Gardner, Milton C. Mecham,
 Joseph L. Bishop
 Wyoming, University of: Joseph Geraud, George C. McCarty,
 Bill Young

District Eight

Bakersfield, California State College: David G. Spencer,
 Rudy Carvajal, George Hibbard
 California, University of, Berkeley: Robert F. Steidel Jr.,
 David L. Maggard
 California, University of, Davis: Joe L. Singleton
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Thomas L. Jacobs,
 J. D. Morgan
 California, University of, Riverside: Franklin A. Lindeburg
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Stephen S. Goodspeed,
 Albert E. Negratti
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Donald Warhurst,
 Barry A. Knight
 California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo:
 Victor A. Buccola, Fred L. Clogston
 Chico, California State University: Ernest W. Maglisco
 Fresno, California State University: J. Gene Bourdet, George F. Ilg
 Fullerton, California State University: Andrew F. Montana,
 Neale R. Stoner
 Hawaii, University of: Paul Durham
 Hayward, California State University: George H. Peterson
 Humboldt State University: Donald G. Clancy
 Long Beach, California State University: Stephen Horn,
 Frank Bowman, Perry C. Moore, K. E. North, John W. Shainline
 Los Angeles, California State University: John W. Hermann,
 Walt Williamson
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Dallas W. Norton, Roger Barnson,
 Bill Ireland

Nevada, University of, Reno: Richard M. Trachok
 Northridge, California State University: Glenn W. Arnett,
 Arthur T. Tait, Sam Winningham
 Oregon, University of: Wendell M. Basye, Norval J. Ritchey
 Oregon State University: John R. Davis, James G. Barratt
 Pacific, University of: Cedric W. Dempsey, Edward S. Betz
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan
 Portland State University: A. Scott Durdan
 Sacramento, California State University: J. Michael Bossert
 St. Mary's College: Donald J. McKillip
 San Diego State University: O. Kenneth Karr
 San Francisco, University of: Rev. Philip P. Callaghan
 San Francisco State University: Vic Rowen
 San Jose State University: Richard Post, John Caine
 Santa Clara, University of: Pat Malley
 Southern California, University of: E. John Larsen
 Stanford University: John W. Harbaugh, Joseph A. Ruetz
 Washington, University of: Harry M. Cross, Joseph L. Kearney
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Ray Nagel

Associate Members

Florida International University: F. L. Ferzacca
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis: Nicholas Kellum
 Miami-Dade Community College (South): Howard R. Hohman
 Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: C. Edward Sherlock,
 George R. Walter
 Ramapo College: Robert N. Hartman

Allied Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: Robert C. James, Marvin Francis
 Big Eight Conference: David Swank, Charles M. Neinas,
 Jack McClelland
 Big Sky Conference: John O. Roning
 Big Ten Conference: Wayne Duke, Charles D. Henry, John D. Dewey
 California College Athletic Association: M. Edward Wagner
 Central Collegiate Conference: Robert D. Karnes
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: L. D. Smith
 College Athletic Conference: Walter Bryant
 East Coast Conference: Ernest C. Casale
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Robert M. Whitelaw,
 Clayton W. Chapman, George R. Bisacca
 Eastern Intercollegiate Baseball League: Baaron-B. Pittenger
 Eastern Intercollegiate Gymnastics League: Edward S. Steitz
 Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association:
 Frederick E. Grunninger
 Far Western Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Ervin C. Delman
 Gulf South Conference: Stanley Galloway
 Indiana Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
 Ivy Group: Ricardo A. Mestres, James M. Littrack
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal
 Mid-American Conference: Fred Jacoby
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Earl Mason, L. T. Walker
 Middle Atlantic Conference: Willis J. Stetson
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ron Roberts

Missouri Valley Conference: A. M. Holmes
 New England College Athletic Conference: Herbert W. Gallagher
 New England Small College Athletic Conference: Robert R. Peck
 New Jersey State College Athletic Conference: William P. Dioguardi
 North Central Conference: Richard G. Koppenhaver
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Michael J. Cleary
 Ohio Valley Conference: Arthur L. Guepe
 Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Jesse T. Hill
 Pacific-8 Conference: Wiles Hallock
 Pennsylvania State Colleges Athletic Conference: Paul E. Ross
 South Atlantic Conference: J. B. Searce
 Southeastern Conference: H. Boyd McWhorter, C. W. Ingram,
 Elmore Hudgins
 Southern Conference: Kenneth G. Germann, J. Dallas Shirley
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: George H. Hobson
 Southland Conference: Dick Oliver
 Southwest Athletic Conference: Cliff Speegle, Harold Lahar,
 Wilber Evans
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: Raymond C. Deuer
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Daniel T. Mullin
 West Coast Athletic Conference: Robert A. Sunderland
 Western Athletic Conference: Stan Bates
 Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Marcus L. Plant

Affiliated Members

American College Health Association: D. L. Cooper, M.D.
 College Athletic Business Managers Association:
 William H. Aspinwall
 College Sports Information Directors of America: Hal Bateman
 International Association of Approved Basketball Officials:
 Anthony W. Senopole, Stewart C. Paxton
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics:
 Michael J. Cleary
 National Athletic Steering Committee: Vannette W. Johnson
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame:
 James L. McDowell Jr., Richard W. Kazmaier
 State of Louisiana Board of Education: Irvin Sibille

Visitors

C. D. Chesley Company: C. D. Chesley
 Connecticut College: Charles Luce
 Cotton Bowl: Field Scovell
 Fiesta Bowl: John Reid
 Gator Bowl Association: George R. Olsen
 Instituto Politecnico Nacional: Jacinto Licea
 Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley, Jerry Foley
 NCAA Films Service: Richard S. Snider
 Orange Bowl Committee: Judge James S. Dunn, Frank Rentz
 Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association: Paul G. Bryan,
 Raymond Dorn, Stanley Hahn, Lathrop K. Leishman,
 William Nicholas, Arthur Welsh
 Spencer Marketing Services: Herb Machol
 Sugar Bowl: Capt. Joe T. Katz, Clifford H. Kern Jr.

Sun Bowl: Harrison D. Kohl, Sonny Yates
 Television Production Center Inc.: Richard L. Clouser
 U.S. Department of Army: Harry J. Oxford

Working News Media

ABC Sports: Don Tollefson
 American Forces Radio: Ken Allen
 Associated Press: Hershel Nissenson, Tom Seppy
 CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: Larry Van Dyne
 Education News Services: Paul G. Ochs
 GREENSBORO DAILY NEWS: Larry Keech
 KANSAS CITY STAR: Bill Sims
 Kendall SPORTS TRAIL MAGAZINE: John S. O'Neill
 KNOXVILLE NEWS-SENTINEL: Tom Siler
 MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL-APPEAL: Basil Brooks
 MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR: George Lapides
 NASHVILLE BANNER: Fred Russell
 NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN: Jimmy Davy
 NEW YORK TIMES: Gordon White
 ROANOKE NEWS: Bill Brill
 SCHOLASTIC COACH: Bruce Weber
 Sportorials: Stewart C. Paxton
 Sports Nippon Newspapers: Tatsuhiko Mori
 STAR-News: Merrell Whittlesey
 TUPELO JOURNAL: Bill Ross
 United Press International: Sam Fogg
 WAVA-CBS: Don Newbery
 WASHINGTON POST: Paul Attner, Don Graham

OPENING SESSION

Monday Morning, January 6, 1975

The 69th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by NCAA President Alan J. Chapman, Rice University, in the Park Ballroom, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.

1. OPENING REMARKS

[President Chapman introduced the members of the NCAA Council and Executive Committee, as listed on pages 114-116 of the 1974-75 NCAA Manual.]

President Chapman: You will notice here that we reach the new record of 135 proposals to be considered. So far, I have only one editorial revision to bring to your attention. That is in connection with Proposal No. 75. The intent is misleading. You should delete the words *athletically related* so that it will read: *That a player is exempted from the counting procedure if he was recruited but does not receive financial aid, and to eliminate O.I. 501 in view of those changes.*

Other than that, I am not aware of any other editorial corrections. Our procedure will be to consider those propositions in the order as presented in the Convention Program. The order may be changed by a two-thirds vote of the voting delegates.

Amendments to these amendments may be submitted, but you are to submit them no later than 1 p.m. today. You will submit them to the Secretary-Treasurer Richard Koenig or to the office suite.

You will recall the amendments to the amendments must conform with that time deadline and may not increase the modification of a proposal. The Council is not restricted by the deadline as far as submitting amendments to amendments, but simply is restricted by the rule that no amendment to an amendment will increase modification.

I also call to your attention the special Convention committees. The Nominating Committee is chaired by Ralph Fadum, North Carolina State University. It is charged with presenting nominations for President, Secretary-Treasurer, and several Council vacancies.

The Committee on Committees, chaired by Jim Higgins, Lamar University, is concerned with nominations for the various general committees and sports committees.

The Committee on Voting, chaired by Boyd McWhorter, commissioner of the Southeastern Conference, will be in charge of the voting. The Committee on Memorial Resolutions is chaired by Robert Frailey, American University, and he will make a report later this morning.

The Committee on Credentials is chaired by H. Evan Zeiger, Samford University.

2. EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURES

President Chapman: Although we will not be involved in formal voting today, I feel compelled to review the voting procedures with

you so you will have time to reflect on them. Basically, the same format or the identical format will be used as last year.

There are four basic voting procedures, voice vote, paddle vote, rising vote and the secret ballot. Here we mainly use the paddles because of the complexities involved in the reorganization.

The voting delegates from institutions having membership in Division I football, will have blue paddles. Other Division I members not competing in Division I football, will have white paddles. Division II will have green paddles, and Division III will have yellow paddles. Normally, when the divisional voting is called for, Division I will show blue and white, Division II green, and Division III yellow. If it is a football only question, only the blue paddles will apply in Division I; and Division II will be green and white paddles.

Constitutional amendments require two-thirds vote of the group as a whole. Only the Bylaws are subjected to the right of voting.

Resolutions, enforcement procedures and Executive Regulations will go to the entire group; but the Bylaws may be or will be considered by each division. Basically, the majority vote is simply required. One division may adopt a Bylaw amendment without the other divisions. Members of a division that adopts a Bylaw provision are bound to it, except there are certain complications.

Last year, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee ruled quite properly there are certain integrated Bylaws refinements which don't make sense unless all three divisions adopt them. These are Bylaw 7 dealing with membership, criteria and dues; Bylaw 8 dealing with Association committees; Bylaw 9 dealing with the methods of amending the Constitution and the Bylaws, and Bylaw 10 which established the divisions. Amendments concerning these Bylaws will be considered by each division but unless all three divisions adopt a particular change, then no change is adopted at all.

All Bylaws proposals will be submitted to each division unless there is a reason not to do so. Such a reason may be the specific wording may apply to only one division or the proposer specifically requested that it be submitted to only one division. Otherwise we would submit it to all three divisions to accept or reject.

In order to speed up the process, and with your permission in the case of non-controversial Bylaws, I am going to attempt to call for voice votes and play like I have three pairs of ears and hear the majority vote in each division. That, obviously, can be challenged; and in many instances from the discussion it will be apparent to me that I shouldn't do that. In the cases where it is obvious that a divisional vote should be taken or someone requests it, my ruling of the three ears can be challenged.

The order in which I choose the division will be rotated from time to time. None of the votes will be announced until all three divisions have done their voting. Once the voting is announced, anyone in any division can ask for reconsideration of the voting in his division since the vote may have been influenced by what somebody else did. The reconsideration request requires a simple majority.

Under reorganization, anyone can ask for the rescission vote of the action of another division. You will recall that the provision provides that if one division adopts a Bylaw amendment, anyone can request a vote of the entire assembly to rescind that action; and it re-

quires a two-thirds vote of the entire assembly to rescind.

If a reconsideration and a vote to rescind are requested simultaneously on one action, the precedence goes to the reconsideration and then to the rescind. Both a reconsideration and a request to rescind can be made any time during the Convention. I realize that it is usually dirty pool to do it late in the Convention when many have gone home, but by parliamentary rule it is possible for someone to ask for that on any proposal that is presented at this Convention.

It sounds awfully complicated when you apply it to 135 proposals. I do hope we make it through the week. I must also point out one thing that I failed to make very clear last time. Proxy voting is not permitted. The voting delegates receive white badges and should receive in their packet the appropriate paddle. Alternates are provided a blue badge, such as I have, and may cast the ballot if the voting delegate does not cast it. However, one institution may not cast the proxy for another institution. If the delegate and alternate leaves, then, of course, no vote can be cast.

Also a policy which I failed to enforce last year was the policy only that delegates and voting alternates may speak to the Convention. That will be the white and blue badges. The pink badges are for visiting delegates and the gold badges are the press.

If you do wish to address the Chair or the assembly, go to one of the microphones; and for the benefit of the reporter in front, please give your name and your institutional affiliation.

3. REPORTS OF SPORTS AND OTHER COMMITTEES

President Chapman: We will turn now to the reports. I presume you all received a copy of the Annual Reports at the time of registration. This book does contain the reports of many of our operating committees. There are several rules, sports and general committees' reports presented in this book. They will not be read to you.

[The motion to accept the reports was regularly made, seconded and approved.]

4. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Article 5 of the NCAA Constitution requires the Secretary-Treasurer to submit to the annual Convention a detailed report of all receipts and disbursements during the preceding fiscal year. It is my pleasure to do so at this time.

The financial report for the period September 1, 1973, to August 31, 1974, is based on the audit submitted by Francis A. Wright and Company, Kansas City, Missouri, a firm of certified public accountants. Also included are the audits of the accounts of the National Collegiate Sports Services, prepared by Steinberg and Stern, certified public accountants of New York City, and the Wright Company's audit of the National Collegiate Realty Corporation. These reports may be found on pages 165-174 of the 1973-74 NCAA Annual Reports.

Assets as of August 31, 1974, totaled \$1,172,437 compared to \$1,390,290.10 for the previous year. That is a decline of \$217,853.10. The Association's cash balances, among those assets, were reduced by \$175,342.24, primarily because of the heavy legal expenses incurred this past year. Another reason for the decline was that, as all of our institutions have experienced, the value of our investments has declined by \$42,687.

I want to call your attention to page 173 of the Annual Reports, specifically to Note B, which shows the disbursements from the Association's Legal Reserve of \$389,519.51, which has resulted in a deficit of \$222,859.37 in that account at the year's end.

On the bright side, although the NCAA's assets declined somewhat during the past fiscal year, it should be pointed out that the National Collegiate Realty Corporation, which is wholly-owned by the NCAA for purposes of holding title to the Association's National Office Building and property, listed assets of \$1,677,081.62 as of August 31, 1974. The combined assets, then, of the NCAA and the Realty Corporation exceed \$2.8 million.

Another bright report, general income for the 1973-74 fiscal year amounted to \$1,768,313.40 as against \$1,646,873.27 for 1972-73. That is an increase of \$121,440. Despite rising costs for all goods and services, general operating expense increased only \$6,581, or less than one percent during the past year. 1973-74 expense was \$1,523,576.80 compared to \$1,516,995.91 the previous year.

Despite known losses of sales because of the move from Phoenix to Mission, Kansas, the NCAA Publishing Service returned \$16,003.98 in net income to the Association, the 15th consecutive year it has operated without subsidy.

Few persons in this room will recall the last time NCAA dues were increased. The year was 1951. The place was Dallas, Texas. The new dues structure will base each member's dues on its NCAA division, rather than undergraduate male enrollment; and it will provide approximately \$89,250, which will be added to the 1975-76 Enforcement Department Budget, along with an additional one-half of one per cent assessment against football television rights fees which will add \$76,750, resulting in an increase of \$166,000 in enforcement spending for 1975-76. You will hear more about that at the Round Table and subsequent discussions.

For the first time in 1974-75, all income and expense of the Association's operating divisions have been incorporated into the General Operating Budget, resulting in a record budget total of \$2,495,000. In the past, the National Collegiate Sports Services and the NCAA Publishing Service Budgets were separate from the NCAA budget. This summer the New York Service Bureau will be moved to the National Office, bringing under one roof virtually all of the Association's employees.

I am pleased to report that the Association membership continues to grow, and the new all-time high is now 806. Of that number, 691 are active members, 28 associate, 51 allied and 36 affiliated. The membership increase of 3.9 per cent during 1974 represents the largest jump in more than 15 years. You can all have your own reasons for that. Personally, I think the reorganization and the expanded championships have been the key factor.

Institutions and organizations which have joined the Association during the past year are:

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Division II

Benedict College
Cameron University

Federal City College
 Indiana State University, Evansville
 Livingston University
 Northern Kentucky State College
 Salisbury State College
 West Virginia Wesleyan University
 University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
 University of Wisconsin, Parkside

Division III

Christopher Newport College
 Eastern Nazarene College
 Gordon College
 Greensboro College
 Hillsdale College
 Jamestown College
 Lynchburg College
 Massachusetts Maritime Academy
 Methodist College
 Newark College of Engineering
 New Hampshire College
 University of North Carolina, Greensboro
 North Carolina Wesleyan College
 Principia College
 Roger Williams College
 Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
 Saint Andrews Presbyterian College
 Southeastern Massachusetts University
 Thomas College
 Virginia Wesleyan College
 Westminster College in Missouri
 Whittier College

ASSOCIATE

Florida Institute of Technology
 Miami-Dade Junior College
 New York Military Academy
 Ramapo College

ALLIED

East Coast Conference
 Independent College Athletic Conference
 Northern Pacific Baseball Conference
 President's Athletic Conference
 Western Collegiate Hockey Association

AFFILIATED

Louisiana State Board of Education
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics
 Mr. President, that concludes my report and I move its adoption.
 [The motion was seconded and approved.]

5. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

William Bell (Fayetteville State University): The National Collegiate Athletic Association Executive Committee consists of eight

members appointed annually by the Council, plus the President and Secretary-Treasurer. The Committee meets three times each year to administer the Association's finances as well as supervise the conduct of the NCAA Championships Program.

The Committee is pleased to report that 1973-74 was a banner year for NCAA championship competition. One thousand, five hundred seventy-eight teams and 9,636 athletes competed in NCAA championships during the past academic year, both of which are all-time records.

The addition of Division II lacross and Division III championships in the sports of cross country, outdoor track and wrestling raised the number of meets and tournaments conducted to 33. As you may remember, the plan of the Special Committee on Reorganization calls for six additional championships to be established by 1976.

The 33 events drew 604,044 paying customers, another all-time record. Gross receipts amounted to \$4,065,369, also a record. Of this amount 23.2 per cent was paid out for game and administrative expenses; 46.1 per cent was returned to the competing teams; 29.2 per cent was retained by the NCAA, and 1.5 per cent was paid to sponsoring agencies according to terms of existing contracts.

The financial summaries of Association meets and tournaments may be found on pages 175-196 of the 1973-74 Annual Reports.

Last August, the Executive Committee approved expansion of the Division I basketball tournament bracket from 25 to 32 teams and also permitted, for the first time, at-large invitations to be issued to a second team from an automatic qualifying conference.

Individual awards for your championships program were increased in size somewhat, and a thorough review was conducted of the number of awards and trophies given in the various events.

Your attention is directed to Proposal No. 51. In order to raise additional funds for expansion of the NCAA enforcement program, the Executive Committee determined that a substantial dues increase is necessary. It also decided this was an opportune time to change our dues base from undergraduate male enrollment to divisions. While the dues increase averages 100 percent per institution, the maximum amount any member will have to pay is \$500. This is well below the dues of other national organizations.

Several changes in the National Office staff assignments were made as a result of the retirement of our long-time friend, Arthur J. Bergstrom. James H. Wilkinson was assigned the responsibilities of building management and convention planning in addition to his duties as director of the National Summer Youth Sports Program.

Louis J. Spry was named controller, replacing Mr. Wilkinson; and Thomas W. Jernstedt was promoted to Assistant Executive Director, with responsibilities for Association's meets and tournaments.

President Chapman: I am not going to call for a vote on the acceptance of that report because the acceptance of the Executive Committee Report—and this will apply to the Council Report which follows in just a moment—has already been implied in the interim action reported in the minutes of those bodies in this book. It would seem a bit unfair to ask you to approve those before you have had an opportunity to read them.

We will delay acceptance of that report until our first business

session on Tuesday afternoon. We will turn now to the Report of the Council, to be given by Jack Fuzak, Michigan State University. In part of his report, Jack will be assisted by Phil Brown, one of our legal counsel, who is a partner in the firm of Cox, Langford & Brown here in Washington, D. C.

6. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): It is my privilege to present the report of the NCAA Council's activities during 1974. When that group was introduced, I am sure some of you wondered why, with such a smart looking group of men, some of the big problems in intercollegiate athletics continue. I am not certain how smart the group is, but one thing I can vouch for is they work awfully hard. They sit in meetings hours on end, and that is kind of par for the course.

I am happy to report, though, that Senator Aitken, in collaboration with the Secretary of Agriculture, is preparing a bill which recognizes the way in which the Council works. Of course, it is called the Aitken-Butz Bill. [Laughter]

The challenges faced by your Council have been numerous and significant. As you look through the minutes of the Council meetings in the 1973-74 Annual Reports, one of the features that will become apparent is the number of new procedures and activities in which your Council was involved.

The Council itself was reorganized, of course, as the new year began, in compliance with the overall reorganization of the Association. The Council elected last January includes four Division II and four Division III representatives, in addition to the eight Division I members.

Reorganization also brought about the formation of three Divisional Steering Committees. Each is comprised of the Council members from the appropriate Division. These Committees are to provide continuing leadership for each of the Association's three divisions, while the Long Range Planning Committee is assigned the overview responsibilities as to organizational and legislative planning.

Specifically, the three Steering Committees are to consider problems uniquely of concern to the members of their respective divisions and to bring those problems, with recommended courses of action, to the attention of the Council. The Steering Committees also serve as review agencies for legislation proposed by members of their respective divisions, and they plan the Divisional Round Tables and related activities at the time of the annual Convention. You will hear from these three Committees in the Divisional Round Tables this afternoon.

The year just past also saw a change in the infractions appeals procedure, under the new provisions of Section 5 of the NCAA Enforcement Program. We are convinced this is one of the most progressive steps taken in NCAA administration because it will speed up the processing of infractions cases and also diminish the number of appeals to come before the Council.

It also was a year of statistical landmarks in the Association's history. You have already heard in the Secretary-Treasurer's Report that our membership passed the 800 mark for the first time. Testimony to the membership's interest in the affairs of the Association

are the 135 amendments in the Official Notice of this Convention. This is 27 more than the previous record.

All of those legislative issues have been reviewed by the Council. Some emanated from the Council during 1974. A number of the proposals were the results of reports to the Council by special committees in the areas of recruiting, foreign athletic recruitment and enforcement.

The Special Committee on Enforcement, responding to widespread concern among the membership, developed the recommendation that the enforcement program of the Association be greatly expanded. The Council and the Executive Committee have endorsed that recommendation. You will hear the rationale behind that important decision during the General Round Table discussion this afternoon. You have already heard how much an expansion would be financed in the reports of the Secretary-Treasurer and the Executive Committee this morning.

A considerable portion of the Council's deliberations as the year progressed dealt with legal issues raised over questions of eligibility, particularly in the sport of ice hockey, and the effect those questions have on the Association's professional rulings. As you know, a special meeting of the Subcommittee on Appeals was held to act on matters of eligibility in the sport of ice hockey.

The first grouping of amendments before you at this Convention reflects the proposed modifications in the Association's professional rulings. I can report to you at this time that the passage of those amendments, in the Council's opinion, would make it unnecessary to propose the discontinuation of ice hockey as an NCAA sport. I must emphasize on behalf of the Council the necessity of assuring that the Association's principles regarding amateurism in all sports will not be compromised by practices peculiar to one sport.

To put it another way, the law of the land requires equal and consistent application of our rules to all of our student athletes. Thus, the central question in ice hockey is whether the administration of amateurism by the members of the NCAA is going to be governed by Canadian customs and practices or whether Canadians who wish to participate in intercollegiate athletics at NCAA members are going to conform to the rules that American youngsters are obligated to observe.

Another major topic of concern on each Council agenda has been women's intercollegiate athletics. You will hear a detailed report on that timely topic during the General Round Table this afternoon. It will also undoubtedly be the subject of numerous "corridor conferences" throughout this Convention.

The NCAA membership has been seeking leadership in the area of women's athletics. Your Council has responded. In fact, the Association has been considering the matter of women's athletics, and conferring and attempting to cooperate with women's amateur sports organizations for more than 11 years. This is not a new area of concern for the Association. It is simply that the emphasis and the problems involved have increased markedly in the past two years.

In response to the membership's request for direction in this matter, your Council directed the NCAA staff to prepare a report and recommendations regarding the NCAA's role in women's intercolle-

giate athletics. That report was received by the Council. It recommends that the Association move now to provide the same meaningful services and high-quality National Collegiate Championship competition, backed by the same administrative support, for women student-athletes and teams of its member institutions as it does for men student-athletes.

It recommends that the only satisfactory approach, considering the demands of court decisions, to the necessary institutional control of all or all of its intercollegiate athletic programs, is to place men's and women's programs under the same administration, the same legislative body and the same eligibility rules.

It further recommends that the NCAA begin immediately to offer national championship competition for women in selected sports. At our meetings here in Washington, your Council voted to approve the concept of that report and referred the recommendations to the Special Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics for implementation at the earliest possible time.

Related to that topic has been the Association's continuing attempt throughout 1974 to bring some degree of reasonableness to the proposed HEW Regulations for implementation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. The Association's Legislative Committee has devoted extensive attention to the undesirable draft regulations emanating from HEW lawyers. A review of that Committee's activity in this regard is contained in the Annual Reports. The current status of Title IX is somewhat uncertain. We do know that HEW was planning to present its final draft to President Ford for approval in late January. However, HEW received more than 9,000 comments concerning Title IX, many dealing with the section on athletics.

It would seem that this deluge would delay preparation of the final draft. In summation, Title IX is not yet in effect, but probably will be soon. The issues are far from settled, and the Council anticipates it will be tested in the courts. Continued expression of the concerns of the schools and colleges to members of the Congress should be helpful.

Our Washington counsel, Mr. Philip B. Brown, who was introduced by your President, is on the dais with me. If any delegate has questions for me or Mr. Brown at the conclusion of this report, we will be happy to try and answer them.

Another major activity during the past year—one in which many of you became involved—dealt with proposed legislation before the United States Senate dealing with amateur sports programs. After substantial effort and with strong school-college support, the Senate passed the Tunney Bill, S.1018, which would provide for a Presidential Commission to investigate the United States Olympic Committee. The Senate also passed the Pearson Bill, S.3500, which would establish a federal board to adjudicate franchise disputes and oversee rights of athletes to participate in international competition. These Senate bills became buried in House Subcommittees, and they will now have to begin the legislative process anew in the next session of Congress. The chairman of the NCAA International Relations Committee, Mr. Charles Neinas, will provide a more detailed insight into several of these matters as the next speaker this morning.

Other legislative and governmental regulatory activities in which

the NCAA was involved during the year included an attempt to revise the copyright provisions governing carriage of sports telecasts by cable TV systems; a successful effort to defer until the need could be more adequately measured, federal legislation to require the presence of a certified trainer at every school and college athletic event, and continuing efforts regarding the Consumer Product Commission's investigation of athletic safety and equipment.

The Council also has received the report of the 1974 NCAA Television Committee. It is in printed form and is available to each delegate. It indicates \$16 million was paid for national football television rights in 1974. Now, 101 member institutions shared in the revenue from the ABC series, on which 54 different colleges appeared. In addition, six members of Division II and Division III appeared in telecasts of the football championship games of those divisions, and 12 teams shared in the revenue therefrom.

The football series was responsible for five other championships being televised. There were numerous promotional shows and messages for college athletics. The Committee praised the new ABC format and was very pleased with the work of play-by-play announcer Keith Jackson.

One basic change in the format of the Television Plan was made during the season. The TV Committee recommended, and the Council approved, changing one of the national dates to regional games to enable more 1974 football teams to appear. Other details about the Television Plan and the TV Committee are available in the printed report.

There were numerous other Council activities and involvements throughout the year, and I will touch briefly on some of them. Early in the year, an equivalencies formula was developed for application to the financial aid limitations of Bylaw 5. For much of the first half of the year, the Council joined the membership in seeking viable means of conserving energy as recommended by the NCAA Energy Committee.

The Council renewed and continued its attempts to meet with representatives of the NAIA in an effort to discuss areas of mutual concern. Unfortunately, such a meeting has not yet become a reality due to apparent lack of interest by NAIA officials. The Council revised the guidelines for athletic consortiums in accordance with Constitution 4-8, and these will appear in the printing of the 1975-76 NCAA Manual.

We are pleased to report that the National Summer Youth Sports Program enjoyed a sixth successful summer in 1974. This year's program included 105 institutions in 75 cities and 37 states, plus the District of Columbia. The enrollment numbered 40,766 participants. The Program, as you know, is a joint undertaking involving the United States Government, the sponsoring institutions and the NCAA.

The cost for 1974 was approximately \$6.4 million. Of that amount, the federal government contributed just over \$2.9 million; the participating institutions more than \$2.8 million; private business and organizations and state and local governments \$370,000; and the United States Department of Agriculture just under \$200,000, and the balance of some \$40,000 by the NCAA.

For this significant Program to continue, Congressional action was

required to authorize and fund it on a permanent basis. The maximum federal contribution of \$3 million had not changed since the Program began. There are approximately 100 additional NCAA members desiring to participate; but that interest has been thwarted by the lack of increased funding, as well as by the familiar effects of inflation.

I am most pleased to report that NSYSP bills have passed both the House and Senate, and it appears possible that the NSYSP will be funded at \$6 million per year for a three-year period. The bill has not yet been signed into law, and the actual appropriation has not yet been approved, but prospects are bright for the continuation and expansion of this outstanding joint venture.

The Council again directed the Association's ongoing campaign to inform the public and the membership of the Association's policies, goals and activities through the NCAA News. The Council remains dedicated to a program of full information and promotion of college athletics throughout the country. It is our conviction that the story of intercollegiate athletics has great merit not only in its own right, but for higher education in general.

Most of you are familiar with the provision of Constitution 6-2, which authorized your Council to interpret the NCAA Constitution and Bylaws between annual Conventions. At each of its meetings, the Council carefully considers numerous interpretations. Those approved are then binding after circularization to the membership, either by direct mail or in the interpretations column in the NCAA NEWS.

Any member may request a review by the Convention of any interpretation, provided that request is in the hands of the Secretary before 1 p.m. the day preceding the final business session. This means, in this year's schedule, by 1 p.m. today.

As 1974 drew to a close, the Council launched another new project that should be of major significance to college athletics. That is the study of season length, squad size, number of contests and other factors relating to economies in program operation. You will hear more about that important survey in each of the Divisional Round Tables at this Convention.

Mr. Chairman, that completes this abridged report of the Council.

President Chapman: As in the case of the Executive Committee Report, I am not going to ask for acceptance now, since you may wish to read the Council minutes between now and tomorrow afternoon. However, you did hear Jack Fuzak say he would answer any questions on his report. If there are questions, we will take them now.

Seeing no one approaching the microphones, we will continue with the report of the International Relations Committee, to be given by Chuck Neinas of the Big Eight Conference. Chuck will be assisted by Phil Brown, if necessary.

7. REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Charles M. Neinas (Commissioner, Big Eight Conference): With the increasing interest in the Olympic Games, we feel it is time to come before you to review the status of the National Collegiate Athletic Association in its relations with the United States Olympic Committee.

Approximately two years ago this Association withdrew as a member of the U.S. Olympic Committee. A great many other organizations—including prominent coaches associations and athletic conferences—resigned their membership in protest of the inefficiencies and mismanagement of the USOC and that organization's appalling lack of responsiveness to the needs of today's athletes and coaches, not to mention amateur sports in general.

It now seems essential that the NCAA consider what has transpired in these intervening 26 months and determine whether conditions have altered to the extent that different policies should be pursued by this Association during 1975. The International Relations Committee presents this report with the concurrence of the Association's Council.

First, a brief review. On October 25, 1972, the NCAA Council voted that the Association withdraw as a member of the USOC. The bases for the Council's decision were outlined by Samuel E. Barnes, then NCAA Secretary-Treasurer and a member of the International Relations Committee, as follows:

Similar proposals (to withdraw) have been before the NCAA Council, on and off, for almost 10 years. Each time the Council has told our delegates to continue to strive for reorganization from within. Not this time. We have had enough.

... It is apparent the current USOC apparatus is not responsive to the needs of those it is primarily supposed to serve—the athletes.

The USOC repeatedly has ignored suggestions advanced by the school-college community designed to improve the administration of the USOC.

The time has come for constructive reform if the United States is to be properly represented and our athletes are to be properly prepared for future Olympic competition.

The United States athletes deserve the finest possible competitive conditions and administration support in order to have a fair opportunity for victory when competing in Olympic Games.

The USOC has shortchanged America. The troubles in Munich at the '72 Games (Mr. Barnes was present at Munich) are only the latest example of the continuous, countless bunglings of the USOC. He concluded by saying the NCAA hopes the American public will join with it in calling for a total reorganization of the USOC.

The dismay at the USOC's continually inept performance and the conviction that major reform was urgently needed, expressed by the NCAA's withdrawal, were widely shared in the United States following the Munich Olympics. One result was the spontaneous formation, under the chairmanship of Mayor Tom Vandergriff of Arlington, Texas, of a group composed of Olympic athletes, athletic administrators and interested citizens, dedicated to the reform of the United States' Olympics effort. This group, the Committee For A Better Olympics, held a number of meetings at which a proposal was drafted which called for a completely restructured Olympics Committee, which would accord athletes a major voice and encourage nationwide participation and interest in the Olympics by organizing the Committee on a state-by-state representative basis.

Another result was the introduction in the U.S. Senate of a bill sponsored by Senator John V. Tunney of California, which provided for the appointment of a commission to study and recommend appropriate reforms of the organization and operation of the U.S. Olympic Committee, presumably to be accomplished by Congressional amendment to the Federal charter of USOC. This measure was immediately adopted in the closing days of the 92nd Congress as an amendment to a bill to provide Federal assistance to Colorado to host the Winter Games; but when the citizens of Colorado rejected the plans to hold the Winter Games in Denver, no further action was taken on the appropriations bill.

It soon was clear, however, that this time the issue was not going to be forgotten. In the opening days of the 93rd Congress in 1973, the widespread dissatisfaction with United States Olympic affairs was reflected in the introduction of a number of bills, including a new bill incorporating the Tunney proposal. The Senate Commerce Committee—which in 1965 had held hearings on problems in track and field—held extensive hearings on these bills in May and November 1973. At the hearings, there was testimony by athletes, coaches and sportscasters, as well as by representatives of the Committee For A Better Olympics, the USOC, the NCAA and other interested organizations. Except for the representatives of entrenched USOC powers, there was unanimity among those appearing at the hearings that the need for reform of this country's Olympics effort is pressing, and that the USOC had shown no sign of willingness to initiate meaningful reform itself.

Following these hearings, the Commerce Committee issued reports recommending adoption of two measures. One, Senate Bill 1018, was the Tunney proposal establishing a commission to study and issue recommendations regarding the organization of the U.S. Olympic effort. As before, when brought to a vote on the Senate floor, that bill was adopted without dissent. The other, Senate Bill 3500, contemplated more direct and immediate action, going to the heart of the problems which have long hampered this country's athletes when participating in amateur sports events at the international level.

Let me digress here to provide a word of background: At the international level, amateur sports competition is governed by sports federations, with a separate federation for each sport in which there is significant competition. Each international federation, in turn, is composed of national members, representing each nation with programs in the sport concerned. By reason of membership in the federation, each national member is accorded certain exclusive, monopoly rights to control the movement of athletes into and out of the country concerned, for the purpose of international competition. Thus the organization in the United States, which is this nation's member in an international sports federation—for example the AAU in track and field—solely by reason of its international membership, is accorded by the other members of the IAAF monopoly jurisdiction over the movement of athletes into and out of the United States for the purpose of track and field competition. In addition, such U.S. holders of international franchises in the Olympic sports are guaranteed, under International Olympic Committee rules, a

majority of the votes in the United States Olympic Committee.

Where, as seems to be the case in most sports and in most countries, the organization holding the international franchise is in fact representative of the preponderance of that nation's interests in the sport concerned, and therefore enjoys substantial national support for the authority it purports to exercise, these arrangements pose no major problem. But where, as has been the case in the United States in recent years with respect to several sports, an international franchise holder is unrepresentative or has otherwise forfeited its claim to national support, then a host of problems and conflicts result, and efforts must be made to obtain recognition of a new, representative franchise holder. To date, this has meant an appeal to the international federation concerned, with both the incumbent franchise holder and the challenger jockeying for international support to decide a question of fundamentally national interest. Moreover, in the United States an attempt was made by the existing franchise holders to make any such challenge even more difficult, by means of the so-called Greenbrier Amendment to the USOC Constitution, which sought to interpose the USOC—a body which they controlled—between any prospective franchise applicant and the international federation.

The Senate Commerce Committee concluded that the basic decision as to which organizations are qualified to be this country's representatives in international federations governing particular sports—and by reason of such membership exercise monopoly powers—was a decision more appropriately made by the United States than by an international sports body, and the agency charged with that responsibility should be neutral and unbiased. Accordingly, it proposed in S.3500 to establish a Federal Board of part-time members, with specific, limited authority to review the composition, qualification and performance of United States holders of international sports franchises, and where more than one organization sought recognition as to a particular sport, to decide in accordance with specified criteria which should be approved as this country's international representative. This carefully developed proposal promised not only better management and representation at the individual sport level, but also indirect reform of the USOC, by reason of the majority control of that body exercised by the franchise holders which the Bill would reorganize.

Both the Tunney Bill and S.3500 were strongly supported by the NCAA.

On the other hand, both the AAU and the USOC displayed considerable reluctance to see Senator Tunney's commission established, and both adamantly opposed S.3500. One result of their fear of these bills was a carefully orchestrated visit to this country by the President of the International Olympic Committee, during which he uttered dark predictions that the United States might be thrown out of the Olympics if S.3500 passed. These predictions were purportedly based on the theory that S.3500 contemplated unacceptable political interference in a national Olympic committee—although the bill took no direct action whatsoever with regard to the USOC. But what made it particularly difficult to give any credence to his predictions, was the fact that in the same breath that he de-

nounced S.3500, the IOC President endorsed an alternative proposal for Federal legislation which, as regards immediate Federal Government intrusion, would have gone much further, by imposing specific requirements directly upon the USOC. This proposal had been developed by the USOC in consultation with the AAU and was introduced by Congressman Mathias, a member of the USOC's own legislative Committee. The only apparent lesson to be learned here is that the USOC is opposed to Federal intervention, unless that intervention takes a form which, by perpetuating the status quo, is acceptable to the Committee. In such a case, it will apparently receive the dutiful endorsement of the IOC as well.

It should also be noted that elements of the Administration also expressed opposition to S.3500, but for different reasons. As we understand it, their problem with the bill was based on opposition to the concept of a Federal Board supervising any form of amateur sports; but the Administration acknowledges that steps must be taken to correct what obviously appears to be an undesirable situation.

Against this background, the USOC-sponsored substitute measure was offered on the Senate floor on July 9, 1974 as a substitute for S.3500. It was resoundingly defeated by a vote of 68 to 23, a three-to-one margin. S.3500 was then adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming vote.

By this time, however, it was late in the 93rd Congress, and the House committees to which S.1018 and S.3500 were referred had full schedules. As a consequence, the bills moved no further before Congress adjourned last month.

While all of this was taking place on the legislative front, there occurred another series of events, relating to the sport of basketball, which I believe should be included here. As many of you know, the AAU had been for many years until early 1973, the United States member of FIBA, the international basketball federation, and as such the AAU was the USOC Group A member for basketball. It is no secret that AAU's basketball program declined dramatically in significance in the years following World War II; and as a result, increasing pressure arose—principally from the school-college community—to replace AAU as United States FIBA member with a broader-based organization, more representative of the various American national basketball programs of current significance.

At Munich in 1972, Basketball Federation of the United States, which for some years had operated in competition with the AAU under sponsorship principally of the school-college community, made a renewed application to FIBA for recognition as its United States member. FIBA in response called upon the Basketball Federation and AAU to meet and jointly find a solution to their differences. For a variety of reasons, no such solution was forthcoming; and in early 1973, FIBA suspended the AAU as its United States member and called upon none other than the USOC, through the chairman of its basketball committee, to temporarily perform the responsibilities of FIBA membership in the United States.

USOC assumed this responsibility, and in reconstituting its basketball committee for the current Olympiad, reappointed the AAU representatives on the Committee to become the new committee ma-

jority, now as *representatives of the USOC Board*, just as though nothing had happened to the AAU's status as United States FIBA member. The AAU basketball chairman was named chairman of the USOC Basketball Committee; and USOC proceeded to prepare a United States team for the FIBA World Championships—notwithstanding the fact that USOC's jurisdiction extends only to the Olympics and Pan American Games.

The Basketball Federation (sometimes called BFUSA) brought suit early in 1974 against USOC for, in effect, conspiring with AAU to interfere with BFUSA's efforts to become FIBA's United States member. USOC tried unsuccessfully to get the lawsuit dismissed as not stating a valid claim. While the suit was then pending, BFUSA resubmitted an application to FIBA, this time for recognition of a new organization, sponsored by BFUSA, to become FIBA's United States member. AAU was offered ample opportunity to join this new organization, but ignored such invitations. In Puerto Rico in July, FIBA granted recognition to the new organization, the Amateur Basketball Association of the United States of America, to replace AAU as its United States member, and formally advised USOC of that fact. USOC, after insisting that ABAUSA apply "retroactively" to USOC for Group A membership (thereby continuing to push the concept of the Greenbrier amendment about which I will speak further in a minute) granted it recognition. The lawsuit then was voluntarily dismissed by BFUSA.

USOC's recognition of the new FIBA basketball member in the United States climaxed 14 years of effort, principally by representatives of the school-college community, to cause the replacement of AAU as United States national representative in a sport where the AAU program had been moribund for over two decades. The climax came about, we regretfully are convinced, only because of the bringing of a lawsuit which was expensive for all concerned, and of AAU's steadfast refusal to concede the pre-eminence in the United States of any basketball program but its own. The further unfortunate lesson learned was that USOC, even after Munich and even after the NCAA's withdrawal, was apparently still prepared to go to considerable lengths to preserve the practical status quo in basketball, while at the same time voicing its willingness to engage in internal reform.

The U.S. Gymnastics Federation, which received international recognition several years ago, has proven what an organization devoted to a particular sport can do. It has been most successful in representing this country in international gymnastics matters in addition to promoting the sport domestically.

Against this background, it is important to examine what the USOC has now purported to do internally, by means of amendments to its constitution last month. Those of you who have read the statements by USOC President Philip Krumm are probably at this point under the impression that recent USOC reform has been substantial indeed. Stripped of rhetorical characterization, however, here is what we understand transpired at the USOC Biennial Membership meeting at Orlando three weeks ago:

1. *Procedures.* Numerous constitutional amendments were allegedly adopted. Unfortunately, the USOC constitutional provisions spec-

ifying the means for proposing and adopting amendments, were ignored or violated in many important particulars—over objection voiced both before and during the meeting. You should be aware that suit was filed last Friday, with the NCAA joining as a plaintiff, to obtain a judicial confirmation of the invalidity of amendment procedures.

2. *Athletes Bill of Rights.* The USOC members were presented with, and voted, a much publicized athletes' bill of rights, characterized publicly by President Krumm as an important step in intersecting the USOC, on behalf of the athlete, into disputes between the NCAA and AAU, and privately by President Krumm as *window dressing*. In point of fact, the provision purports to protect the rights of individuals to participate in all international athletic competition—not merely the Olympic or Pan American competition over which the USOC has jurisdiction—against interference by third parties.

Two points should be emphasized. First, in order to qualify for USOC protection, the individual must be eligible under *reasonable* national and applicable international rules. Thus, for example, if the AAU, enforcing an IAAF eligibility rule for track and field, disqualifies an athlete from competition, the bill of rights doesn't cover the situation and no right is created or protected. Second, while there is an exception in favor of educational institutions which gives an athlete a hearing and thereafter determines that his academic or athletic interest will be injured by his participation in an international event as proposed, there is no such exception—with or without hearing—in favor of rules of an association of educational institutions, such as this one. Thus covered by the bill of rights would have been the decision of two student-athletes to participate in the 1973 AAU-sponsored U.S.-Russian track meet, notwithstanding the refusal by the AAU to obtain certification from the NCAA under this association's extra event rules.

3. *Greenbrier Amendment.* As many of you know, one of the NCAA's objections to the USOC constitutional structure has been the existence of the so-called Greenbrier Amendment, which in effect provides that a challenger for the right to act as the United States member of an international sports governing body—the USOC Group A member, if you will—must apply to the USOC for approval, before making application to the international body. The USOC members at their recent meeting in Orlando voted the Greenbrier Amendment out of the constitution. Was this progress? Unfortunately not, we believe, because as a part of another constitutional amendment about which I will speak in a minute, the USOC made it clearer than ever that a challenger for membership in an international sports governing body must first apply, as a practical matter, to the USOC. The new provision to which I refer is that relating to arbitration of the right to be the United States member of an international sports governing body; and that new arbitration provision expressly provides that in order to invoke its terms, a national amateur sports organization must apply for and be denied membership in Group A of the USOC—a requirement which is no different than that which was contained in Greenbrier.

4. *Arbitration.* The USOC has focused much attention on the new

arbitration provisions, which were also presented to the members and were approved. These provisions come directly out of the bill proposed by Congressman Mathias as the USOC's answer to S.3500. As you recall, the concepts of the Mathias Bill were overwhelmingly voted down in the U.S. Senate. S.3500, on the other hand, provided what our International Relations Committee believed to be a significant basis for fair challenge to the capacity of an existing national member of an international sports governing body, better to represent the United States than a challenging organization. Our Committee believes that the Mathias Bill, while superficially purporting to provide a right of challenge, is so written as to favor at almost every turn the existing national member, and therefore, in the ordinary case, to preserve the status quo. Apparently the U.S. Senate agreed.

A few specific examples of the deficiencies of the Mathias approach are the following:

a) Under Mathias, the burden in the arbitration proceeding is upon the challenger; in S.3500, the burden of proof was shared equally by the challenger and challenged organization.

b) Mathias places no limit upon the number of sports in which a particular organization can act as the national member. S.3500 would have placed severe limits on such multiplicity of membership. The practical difference is obvious: under Mathias, the AAU can go on acting as national member in a multiplicity of sports; S.3500 would have broken up this combine and allowed new federations, dedicated to the advancement of particular sports, to assume responsibility for those respective sports.

c) Mathias contains the sketchiest provisions with regard to conduct of the arbitration; S.3500 is explicit and detailed.

d) Mathias contains only a modest requirement on the USOC to support the decision of the arbitrators; S.3500 would have accorded a successful applicant the exclusive right to approve international competition in the United States, and provided further that the application for membership to the appropriate international federation was to be forwarded by the President of the United States.

I might add that a private arbitration proposal, incorporating the principal features of S.3500 but substituting private arbitrators for a governmental review board, was offered to the USOC Board of Directors for consideration as a constitutional amendment. This proposal was ruled out of order by President Krumm. Subsequently, it was forwarded to the USOC membership, along with other constitutional proposals, without any comment or review by the Board—notwithstanding the fact that the USOC Constitution requires such comment and review.

5. *AAU Control.* Much has been said in recent years about the dominance exercised by the AAU over the USOC. The USOC has always responded by claiming that the AAU has less than an absolute majority of the votes in the USOC—a statement which is certainly true if everybody shows up and votes. That everybody does not show up and vote is evident from the lack of a quorum present to consider constitutional amendments at the USOC Board meeting in Milwaukee three months ago, and from the modest turnout—except

by the AAU and other Group A members—at the USOC membership meeting in Orlando.

Against this background, I am compelled to note that at the Orlando meeting, the USOC membership voted to grant the AAU double representation on its Board of Directors for the sports of swimming and track and field, and also, as a practical matter, voted the AAU three additional directors by making it a Group B member as well as a Group A member. So far as we can determine, the AAU is now the only organization which enjoys membership in more than one group in USOC.

In this connection as well, we might note that the USOC Constitution was also amended in Orlando to make clear that the Group A members will have, at any one time, two-thirds voting control. This is undoubtedly a substantial increase in power for the group A members (of which of course AAU is predominant); and we now have the situation where 20 or 30 individuals, representing these Group A members, have absolute control over USOC affairs. Even the IOC rules require only that Group A members have simple majority control, but a mere majority is apparently not believed sufficient to assure absolute control for this small group. One really wonders whether such a step best serves the interests of this country's Olympic effort. It is certainly contrary to the approach of the Committee for a Better Olympics, which would have made USOC's structure more representative, not less, of individuals and groups committed to the development of international athletic competition.

6. *Sulger Amendment.* Another source of NCAA criticism of USOC management has been the so-called Sulger Amendment, which required that a majority of members of the operating sport committee of the USOC, which as a practical matter administers United States representation in that particular sport at the Olympic and Pan American Games, be drawn from the United States national member of the international sports governing body in that sport. The NCAA and others have contended, quite correctly we believe, that such a provision was not required by IOC rules and in many sports meant that an organization with no effective national program in the sport in question nonetheless controlled operations of the committee for that sport. Until three months ago, basketball was a good example of this anomalous situation—with AAU enjoying majority control with no significant national program and, in fact, having been suspended by FIBA as its national member.

Response of the USOC at its recent meeting to this criticism has been, we believe, quite distressing. USOC has done away entirely with the sport committees, and has placed primary responsibility for selecting and nominating athletes and team officials in the hands of the national member of the international sports governing body itself, i.e., the Group A member. Thus, instead of moving to make the all-important sports committees more representative of a variety of interests, the USOC has chosen to make them now not representative at all, or stated precisely, representative of the interests only of the national members of the international sports governing body for the particular sport concerned.

Much as we would like to offer to this Convention the conclusion that sufficient reform has occurred within the USOC as to permit

serious consideration to be given to reapplication by the NCAA for membership, this is simply not the case. Assuming that all of these constitutional changes have validly been adopted by USOC, how do they relate in summary to the objections voiced by the NCAA upon withdrawing two years ago?

- We objected to Greenbrier. It has been deleted, but has been replaced by another provision having the same operative effect.
- We objected to Sulger. It has been deleted, but like the proverbial baby with the bathwater, so has the entire concept of USOC sport committees. Now participation in each sport is effectively controlled by the United States member of the international, and as a practical matter, no one else has a voice in the administration process.
- We sought a fair means for determining whether some organization other than the existing USOC Group A member was better qualified to act in that capacity. As a result of strong Congressional pressure, a purported mechanism for achieving this end has been adopted. On closer scrutiny, however, the mechanism—while perhaps moving in the right direction—appears best calculated to preserve things as they are within USOC, not to change them.
- We objected in general to the AAU's continuing dominance over USOC affairs. So far as we can see, none of the amendments even slightly disturb this state of affairs, and in fact AAU's dominance appears to have been solidified. No single amendment is better evidence of what the game was all about than that which returned to AAU, by means of double representation in swimming and track and field, the directorships it had lost in gymnastics and basketball.

At the bottom line of all of this is the welfare of the athletes, and through them, the success and integrity of this country's Olympic effort. Constitutional amendments carefully calculated to preserve the administrative status quo do not seem particularly designed to augment the athletes' welfare. But that's OK, so the USOC script goes—the athletes have been pacified with a bill of rights exquisitely designed not so much to provide any enforceable substantive rights for athletes, as to give the USOC executive director a tin sabre to rattle at the NCAA, and as to codify into the USOC Constitution the immunity which the international sport federations and their United States members enjoy from challenge by athletes or others.

We all watch with interest the development of the U. S. Collegiate Sports Council and the increased participation by our college athletes in the World University Games. This program is a natural extension of intercollegiate athletics and a superb training ground for future Olympians.

What actually can be done to improve the Olympic situation for 1976? The International Relations Committee recommends the following course of action:

1. We urge Senator Tunney to reintroduce his bill, which I previously described. It has already been passed once by the Senate, and we trust that it can proceed rapidly through that body and hope it will be well received in the House.

2. We encourage the Senate Commerce Committee to again hold hearings on the USOC and challenge the Olympic Committee to document any improvements which are responsive to the demands for meaningful reform.
3. Hopefully, President Ford will move with dispatch in the appointment of a Commission to review the USOC and its operation. We understand that the President is considering such action.

Finally, let us warn the American public that there have been no significant or meaningful changes in the operation of the Olympic Committee. While the rest of the world continues to show progress, the USOC is moving backwards.

American athletes are the finest in the world, and they deserve far better treatment than they have received.

Mr. Chairman, I move this report be received at this time.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

8. REPORT OF THE NATIONAL OPERATING COMMITTEE ON STANDARD ATHLETIC EQUIPMENT (NOCSAE) AND RELATED SPORTS MEDICINE ISSUES

Carl Blyth (University of North Carolina): The National Operating Committee on Standard Athletic Equipment was established about four years ago at the urging of the NCAA and the National Federation of State High School Associations.

At that time, they brought together in one group the sports equipment dealers, the representatives from the factories, the administrators, the NCAA, the National Federation and the new National Junior College Athletic Associations. The problem was to establish the standards for the athletic equipment being used in the nation's high schools and colleges.

The first task, of course, was to look at the helmet. For the past four years, we have been working on establishing some kind of standard for the helmets. The work is being carried out at Wayne State University in Detroit under the direction of Dr. Floyd Hopson, the engineer, as well as Dr. Thomas, the head of the Department of Neurosurgery.

The laboratory tests were established; and to be sure the laboratory was doing the proper work, the materials were sent out to the National Bureau of Standards and to a laboratory in Toledo, and the results were identical.

We now have recommended that all helmets bought in 1975 by colleges and high schools carry the NOCSAE approval; and in 1978 all helmets on student-athletes in colleges and high schools will have a stamp of approval.

It was fine in the laboratory. The real test is what it does in the field. Let's take a look at the data we collect on football fatalities. Last year there were fewer fatalities reported in football than in any year since the service was established. This year we have found the same results. We feel that we have found something and are on the right track.

There also is a question about the inordinate number of fractures we have been finding in high school and college athletics. The football helmet has been indicated for this because of the hardness, so

we are still working on a helmet. Right now, we are hoping to soften it up. We have had various reports from various institutions where this has been done with good luck, but we do not have hard data. We are working on it in the laboratory, and we are hopeful in six months or a year we will have something.

Bill Braden has helped us in relation to what is going on in government. We are hoping that our standards for athletic equipment will be accepted voluntarily. We will establish what we want rather than to be forced to do it by the Federal government, specifically the Consumer Products Safety Commission.

In conclusion, we think that our results warrant continued support of NOCSAE. I move the acceptance of the report.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

9. REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Robert Frailey (American University): We pause at this time to honor the memory of our colleagues who have passed away since our last national Convention. The Memorial Resolutions Committee expresses to the families of our departed friends our deepest sympathy and recalls in appreciation their friendship during our work in the development of intercollegiate athletics.

We ask the members of this Association to join with us in these remembrances, as we read the names of our departed members, with a moment of silent prayer.

Forrest C. Allen, University of Kansas
 Edward N. Anderson, DePaul University
 Donald S. Baker, University of South Dakota
 Richard Baker, University of Cincinnati
 John J. Blake, Niagara University
 Seward Bower, University of Notre Dame
 Hoyt Brawner, University of Denver
 Al Caniglia, University of Nebraska, Omaha
 James Clements Jr., Georgia Southern College
 Harold Coldwell, Navy
 James H. Decker, Syracuse University
 Charles DeWare, Texas A&M University
 Joseph Dolan, Northeast Missouri State University
 Ted Ducey, Claremont-Mudd Colleges
 Wilbur Duckworth, University of Washington
 Thomas Elliott, St. John's University
 Herbert Erickson, Tufts University
 Tommy Evans, University of Akron
 William Feldhaus, Indiana University
 Edward T. Flynn, Niagara University
 Lee Floyd, University of Southern Mississippi
 James A. Freeman, University of Scranton
 Eugene Gallagher, LaSalle College
 William Gould, Dartmouth College
 William Haney, University of Southern California
 Henry Harris, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
 Arthur Haussler, Bradley University
 Emil Havach, Lehigh University
 Jack Heppinstall, Michigan State University
 O. E. Hollingsbery, Washington State University

Maury John, Drake University
 Fred Kelley, University of Southern California
 Karl E. Lieb, NCAA Past President, University of Iowa
 Charles Loftus, Yale University
 Martin McDonagh, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
 Rev. Edward McKee, Villanova University
 Edward McKee, University of Notre Dame
 DeOrmond McLaughry, Dartmouth College
 Edward McMillan, Brown University
 Mill Mokray, Rhode Island College
 Dewey Morrow, University of San Diego
 Albert Muyskens, Calvin College
 Tom O'Connor, Loyola University
 Bernie Okene, St. Peter's College
 Harry Ottenbreit, Denver University
 Frank Palamara, Michigan State University
 Al Parker, Purdue University
 Orville Paul, Washington University, St. Louis
 James Phelan, St. Mary's College, California
 Leonard Raffensperger, University of Iowa
 Roy Randall, Haverford College
 Claude Reeds, West Texas State University
 William Reese, Eastern Washington University
 Ray Richards, Pepperdine University & UCLA
 Ed Rozy, Marquette University
 Greg Ruth, University of Oklahoma
 Philip Sachs, Lawrence Institute of Technology
 Everett Shelton, University of Wyoming
 Robert Simpson, Iowa State University
 Thomas Stafford Jr., Carson-Newman College
 Joe Steinauer, University of Wisconsin
 Colin Stewart, Case Western Reserve University
 Frank Summers, Virginia Military Institute
 J. Wilder Tasker, Rutgers University
 William Thom, Indiana University
 Gilbert Tom, University of Hawaii
 Burr VanNostrand, University of Missouri, Rolla
 Bill Ward, St. John's University
 Phillip Weinert, Villanova University
 Ralph Welch, University of Washington
 Harry Wienberger, Dickinson College
 Frederick Wolfe, Mid-Winter Sports Association President
 Giles Wright, Xavier University of Louisiana
 Ben Zola, Catholic University

[The assembly stood in a moment of silent prayer in memory of their departed colleagues.]

Mr. President, this is the Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. We ask that it be received and that the families be notified of our expression of sympathy and of our pleasant memories of our departed friends.

President Chapman: I will assume your reverence in standing means you have accepted that report. I am going to ask Mr. Frailey, after adjournment, to linger here in case there are additional names

to be added. If so, we can consider an amendment to this report at our Tuesday afternoon session.

10. ADDITIONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Grover Murray (Texas Tech): I would suggest that in relation to the International Relations Committee Report, in the urgency of passing legislation, you consider making contact with two rather powerful organizations in higher education—the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, which has direct contact with all of the Senators and many Representatives throughout the nation; and the American Council on Education. If you could contact Mr. Huwett, who is located here in Washington, the head of the National Association, and Dr. Roger Himes, the President of the National Council, I think both of these organizations will willingly throw their weight behind these organizations and help organize the Olympics.

President Chapman: Thank you, President Murray. I believe that concludes our business. As you all know, we will convene for the Round Table this afternoon, and we are recessed until that time.

[The Convention recessed at 11:30 a.m.]

DIVISION I ROUND TABLE

Monday and Tuesday, January 6-7, 1975

The Round Table sessions of Division I of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were held from 1 to 3:30 p.m., Monday, January 6, and from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m., Tuesday, January 7, in the Park Ballroom of the Sheraton-Park Hotel, J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin, presiding. The panelists included Ernest C. Casale, Temple University; Ralph E. Fadum, North Carolina State University; John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University; George F. Ilg, California State University, Fresno; J. William Orwig, Indiana University; David Swank, University of Oklahoma, and Harry E. Troxell, Colorado State University. Each was a member of the Division I Steering Committee. Also serving as panelists for the Monday session only were Fred Jacoby, Mid-American Conference; Louis A. Myers, University of Arizona, and Rix N. Yard, Tulane University.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the Round Table discussions. The verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Limiting Advance Scheduling

Messrs. Fuzak and Yard described several disadvantages of and objections to long-term advance scheduling in the sports of football and basketball, including the negative effects such scheduling has on the quality of competition; the uncertainty of future academic calendars, possibly resulting in games during examination and vacation periods; the obstacle to the formation of new playing conferences in those sports; the obstruction to Division II institutions attempting to move to Division I in the sport of football based upon strength of schedule, and the unknown future economic picture precluding negotiation of the actual terms of contracts for future contests. At least two objections were registered from the floor concerning NCAA legislation to limit advance scheduling in football and basketball. They related to whether the Association could legally affect existing or future contracts between institutions and whether such legislation would unnecessarily infringe upon institutional autonomy. A straw vote was taken to determine whether Division I members felt advance scheduling, as currently practiced, was a problem. The vote was virtually unanimous that such a problem existed. Straw votes were taken on the actual number of years competition should be scheduled in advance, but definite preference was not evident.

Graduate Student Eligibility

Mr. Fadum voiced support of Proposal No. 20, submitted for Convention action by the Missouri Valley Conference to permit graduate students, who were eligible under the NCAA five-year rule, to participate. Several individuals voiced their support of this proposal on the basis that it encouraged academic progress and did not discriminate against the good student. Mr. Troxell and others voiced objections to permitting graduate students to participate indicating that intercollegiate athletic programs traditionally have been for under-

graduate students and permitting graduate students to participate would give advantage to some institutions with professional schools and graduate programs in terms of recruiting prospective student-athletes. Further, Mr. Troxell indicated that other NCAA regulations would have to be amended to permit such things as financial aid and other types of eligibility for graduate students which are now precluded by that legislation. A straw vote on Proposal No. 20 resulted in a few more delegates voting in favor of permitting graduate students to participate. A substantial number of delegates did not vote.

Length of Season Study

Mr. Jacoby, a member of the NCAA Council's Special Committee on Length of Season, explained the purpose of a study to inquire into the length of season in many sports, the number of contests conducted in the various intercollegiate sports, the size of squads in different sports, spring football practice, preseason and out-of-season practice sessions in all sports, and the number of coaches assigned to different sports. Additional items would be studied by the Committee as well. He indicated that the Special Committee requests the cooperation of Division I member institutions in responding to the survey which will be circulated.

Discussion of Legislative Proposals

The Round Table discussion centered on legislative proposals to be voted upon by the 69th annual Convention.

Amateurism

Mr. Myers, chairman of the NCAA Council's Special Committee on Professional Rulings, explained the legislative proposals proposed by the NCAA Council (Nos. 1-5). He indicated the intent of these proposals was principally to eliminate any possible distinction between or application to aliens and United States citizens, to preclude possible inappropriate application of these rulings to athletes who have participated on teams sponsored by outside amateur organizations and to make certain the Association's amateur rulings apply equally to participants in all sports without exceptions for any particular sport. Mr. Myers spent considerable time explaining the intent, meaning and purpose of each of these proposals.

Satisfactory Progress

There was extensive discussion from the panel and the floor concerning Proposals Nos. 18 and 19 related to the adoption of a satisfactory progress requirement as an amendment to NCAA Constitution 3-3-(c). It was noted that Proposal No. 18, sponsored by the NCAA Council, determined normal progress eligibility at the beginning of each academic year whereas Proposal No. 19, submitted by the Pacific-8 Conference, provided for satisfactory progress to be determined at the end of each term. There was considerable discussion of the proper interpretations of these proposals as well as noticeable sentiment expressed that there should not be a satisfactory progress rule at the national level.

Alien Student Rule

Mr. Thompson explained the NCAA Council's opposition to Proposal No. 29 submitted by the Pacific-8 Conference to delete Bylaw 4-1-(f)-(2), indicating that on the advice of the Association's legal

counsel, this provision, although inoperative by court order, should remain in Bylaw 4 until the litigation is finally completed.

Financial Aid Limitations

Mr. Swank led a discussion of Proposals Nos. 75-91. Particular discussion centered on Nos. 75 and 76, proposed by the NCAA Council; No. 81, proposed by the Big Eight Conference; No. 82, proposed by the Pacific Coast Athletic Association, and Nos. 85 and 151 proposed by the Missouri Valley Conference. All of these proposals, with the exception of Nos. 85 and 151, dealt mainly with amendments to existing financial aid limits, whereas the Missouri Valley Conference proposals introduced a new feature related to limiting financial aid to tuition, fees and earned income up to the maximum NCAA limit in all sports but football and basketball. There was considerable discussion and debate concerning these proposed amendments although there was not an expression by straw vote on any of the proposals.

Recruiting

There was considerable discussion on Proposal No. 93 which in effect limits, during the recruiting process, any type of arrangements, offers or gifts to a prospective student-athlete, his family or friends except the recommendation of institutionally administered financial aid for the student-athlete's educational costs. Particular objections were raised to the part of this proposal limiting on institution from arranging employment or legitimate loans. Proposal No. 153, submitted by Oregon State University to amend No. 93 to permit loans and jobs was discussed. Mr. James also explained proposals from the NCAA Council's Special Committee on Recruiting.

Out-of-Season Practice

Mr. Myers reported on the actions of the NCAA Council's Special Committee on Out-of-Season Practice which resulted in the Council sponsoring Proposals Nos. 119 and 120. It was the reasoning of the Special Committee and the Council that there should be more stringent guidelines applied to restrict and define activities to be conducted in out-of-season physical conditioning classes and programs.

Enforcement Procedure

Walter Byers, NCAA executive director, explained proposed amendment No. 148 to Proposal No. 66 which was submitted by California State University, Long Beach, to provide an opportunity for NCAA legislation to be directed to coaches and other athletic department personnel involved in a violation of the Association's Principles of Ethical Conduct regardless of whether the individual is employed at the member institution involved in the violation of NCAA legislation. It was emphasized that the NCAA Council neither endorsed nor opposed this proposal.

Other Legislative Proposals

In addition to the proposals previously identified, there was various discussion of Proposals Nos. 11, 12, 23, 27, 37, 49, 53, 54 and 95-105.

DIVISION II ROUND TABLE

Monday and Tuesday, January 6-7, 1975

The Round Table sessions of Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were held from 1:15-3:25 p.m. Monday, January 6, and from 9:40-11:15 a.m. Tuesday, January 7, in the Richmond-Arlington Room of the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Stan Marshall, South Dakota State University, presiding. Panelists included William Exum, Kentucky State University; Franklin A. Lindeburg, University of California, Riverside, and John W. Winkin, University of Maine, Orono. Each was a member of the Division II Steering Committee. Other panelists for the Tuesday session only were Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer, and Ernest C. Casale, Temple University.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the Round Table discussions. The verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Division II Survey

Mr. Marshall, chairman of the Division II Steering Committee, reviewed the results of a survey conducted by the Committee during the fall of 1974, noting that the response to survey items regarding competitive criteria for Division II, the 2,000 rule for that division and financial aid based on equivalencies had resulted in proposed legislation before the 69th Convention. Response to a survey item regarding Division I members with football programs in Divisions II and III had resulted in a special breakfast meeting designed to air the concerns of those institutions.

Length of Season Study

Mr. Lindeburg, chairman of the Special Committee on Length of Season, explained the purposes of the study to be conducted by the Committee. He emphasized the importance of the project, particularly in the area of determining possible economies in athletic programs, and urged all member institutions to respond to the survey.

2,000 Rule

It was explained that Proposal No. 21, to apply the 2,000 rule to Division II, was offered as an amendment because the Division II survey indicated a strong interest in such legislation. Mr. Winkin declared that the primary purpose of that offering was to make it possible for Divisions II and I to have the same academic requirement, if desired, and that the Steering Committee did not necessarily support or oppose the proposal.

Eligibility Rules

Proposal No. 35, to consolidate the provisions of Section 1 and 6-(b) of Bylaw 4, was discussed in detail. It was emphasized that Proposal 35-A, if approved, would apply the Association's eligibility rules for championships to in-season participation. Proposal 35-B could be voted upon regardless of the fate of 35-A and would retain the most demanding requirements of each Section where similarities

exist, as well as recodifying the present Bylaw 4-1. Mr. Casale, author of the amendment, appeared during the Tuesday session to answer specific questions and pointed out that a difference would result regarding the transfer rule if Proposal 35-B were approved.

Seasons of Competition

A straw vote was taken regarding Proposal No. 41, to permit four years of intercollegiate competition after the freshman year provided the student-athlete did not compete during his freshman year. Opposition to the *red-shirting* aspect of this proposal was discussed. The straw vote was in favor of the proposal, 51-27. A later show of hands indicated a definite desire to vote on that proposal by divisions.

Dues of Members

The background of Proposal No. 51, to increase the dues of members (with the increase allocated for expansion of the enforcement program) and to base those dues on divisional membership rather than enrollment, was reviewed at length. Secretary-Treasurer Koenig appeared before the group on Tuesday to add additional background. He explained that the enforcement expansion would be financed by both the dues increase and an additional television assessment, if Proposal No. 51 were approved. He pointed out that the Association had not increased dues since 1951, and also reviewed the current allocation of television moneys to support Division II and Division III championships. It was also emphasized that the controlled television plan affords protection to the programs of all members competing in football, and that the TV Plan is submitted to the membership and receives overwhelming approval each year. Mr. Koenig further reported that 48 per cent of the infractions cases considered by the enforcement department in the past five years involved members of Divisions II and III.

Membership Divisions

Proposals Nos. 55, 56 and 58, all dealing with membership divisions, drew considerable attention. The desire of some members for total self-determination was expressed; and the Council's opposition to that concept, based on the intent of the reorganization plan adopted by the Association in 1973, was reviewed. A straw vote regarding Proposal No. 55, to permit a Division II or III member to elect to participate in Division I in basketball, showed 46 in favor and 49 opposed.

Division II Criteria

Proposal No. 59, to establish competitive criteria for Division II, attracted several objections primarily regarding institutions with a number of traditional or geographically desirable rivalries with Division III institutions or NAIA members. A straw vote indicated 16 in favor of the proposed criteria and 46 opposed. Mr. Marshall noted that 76 per cent of those responding to the Division II survey had favored divisional criteria.

Maximum Awards

Proposal No. 89, to reduce permissible awards in football in Division II and to specify that institutions not wishing to be eligible for the Division II championship in that sport could use the current Division I limitations, was strongly opposed by several institutions, pointing to emphasis on football in their geographic regions and to

traditional rivalries with Division I institutions. A straw vote showed 22 in favor and 54 opposed to the proposal.

Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

The group discussed in detail the topic of women's intercollegiate available until the Council's meetings at the Convention. Several championships for women. Several delegates objected to the fact that they had not received advance information on that proposal; and it was explained that the Council had ordered a complete study of the matter at its October 1974 meeting, with the results of that study not available until the Council's meetings at the Convention. Several delegates expressed their cognizance of the need to have one organization administering intercollegiate athletics and the legal pressure on the Association to provide equal competitive opportunities for women student-athletes, noting that some factions of the AIAW also favor that approach. Others emphasized the need for more study and continued attempts to cooperate with AIAW in seeking a mutually satisfactory solution. Noting that the proposal to the Convention as it was known at the time would call for a study of instituting pilot championships for women, the groups voted 73-4 in favor of the proposal in a straw vote.

Role of Steering Committee

At various times during the Round Table, members of the Division II Steering Committee emphasized the desirability of division members expressing their desires and concerns to the Committee throughout the year. The Committee's role is to provide the day-to-day leadership for Division II, and all Division II members were urged to forward legislative proposals, questions and opinions to any member of the Steering Committee during the year to assist the Committee in providing that leadership.

1975 DIVISION III ROUND TABLE

Monday and Tuesday, January 6 and 7, 1975

The Round Table sessions of Division III of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were held from 1-3:30 p.m. Monday, January 6, in Exhibition Room No. 1, and from 9:30-11:30 a.m. Tuesday, January 7, in the Cotillion Room South, of the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Ross H. Smith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, presiding. Panelists included James E. Hawkins, Fort Valley State College; Walter L. Hass, University of Chicago, and Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College. Each was a member of the Division III Steering Committee.

[NOTE: The following is a summary of the Round Table discussions. The verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

Length of Season Committee

David B. Eavenson, Dickinson College, reported on the work of the Length of Season Committee, of which Franklin A. Lindeburg, University of California, Riverside, is chairman and Mr. Eavenson is a member. He alerted delegates to the Committee's survey of the membership which he predicted would provide significant information to the Association and would enable the Committee to conduct its deliberations and base its recommendations upon accurate facts concerning the Association and the programs of the membership.

Discussion of Legislative Proposals

The meeting then undertook a discussion of the proposed legislation which was to come before the 69th Convention. Because of the volume of proposals, it was agreed to concentrate upon items of particular interest to Division III.

Chairman Smith briefly reviewed the voting procedures and the timing for submission of amendments to amendments. He noted Division III is the largest of the Association's divisions. He emphasized it was the Steering Committee's responsibility to convey any consensus by the Round Tables to the Council and to the membership at the General Round Table. Attention was devoted to proposals No. 18 and 19, satisfactory progress measures, with one speaker urging their defeat on the basis of diminution of institutional prerogative. In a straw vote, nearly unanimous opposition was expressed to proposal No. 18.

In answer to a question about the inclusion of a vote on the 2,000 rule for Division III, Mr. Smith explained it had been proposed originally for Division II and the Council felt Division III also should have the opportunity to consider the matter. He noted that no measure may be considered by a division if the Convention Program does not include it for consideration by that division. A straw vote on proposal No. 22, the 2,000 rule, showed unanimous opposition.

Discussion was held on item No. 26, which stated a transfer to a Division III institution who had received no athletically-related financial aid could be immediately eligible for championship competition. A straw vote was held on the measure, with 63 voting in favor and 39 opposed.

Proposal No. 33, which would cut the residence requirement from one year to 18 weeks, was discussed. A straw vote on it resulted in a 24 in favor and 44 opposed.

Items 60 and 61 concerning the need criteria for financial aid in Division III were discussed at length. Some objection was expressed to No. 60 on the grounds that those speakers felt Division III was going entirely to a need basis for all athletically-related aid and the academic honor awards seemed to be stepping away from that commitment. Others felt as strongly that the honor awards were limited in number and an academic prerogative of the institution. A suggestion was made that the 20 per cent be not of the high school class of the student, but of the students admitted to the particular institution.

Consideration moved to items 103 and 104. No. 103 would require common playing rules for all three divisions. No. 104 called for one-platoon football. Generally, those in attendance favored common playing rules and a questionnaire distributed by Mr. Whispell indicated opposition to one-platoon football by a two-to-one margin.

Discussion was held on Proposal No. 56, which would permit Division III institutions to participate in Division II in one sport, other than football and basketball, in addition to participating in Division I in one sport. Mr. Smith explained the Committee on Reorganization had spent long hours on this area and finally had concluded extending the present rule of one sport would blur and weaken the divisional designations. Also, it was pointed out that if one institution wishes to go up in two sports, a second may wish to go up in three, etc. A straw vote on the proposals indicated opposition of approximately three to one.

Round Table Agenda

Discussion turned from the proposed legislation to items on the Round Table agenda. The first topic was criteria for Division III membership. It had been proposed that enrollment size might be a factor. By a show of hands, it was determined the following were the enrollment sizes of the institutions represented at the Round Table:

Under 500	—	9	1500-2499	—	21
500-750	—	25	2500-3999	—	10
750-1499	—	31	Over 4000	—	7

It was unanimously agreed size should be not a membership criterion.

Scheduling was considered next as a criterion, but the majority opposed it, pointing out some institutions, due to geography, simply cannot schedule an entire season against Division III opponents. Others wished to have freedom in scheduling.

The discussion returned to the subject of academic honor awards. Concern was expressed that such awards might become athletic grants-in-aid. One speaker suggested that even academic awards be based on need, while another suggested a change in Bylaw 11 to eliminate academic honor awards entirely. One delegate claimed honor awards should be given only without reference to athletic ability. Another pointed out the great differences in the types of aid given different students. Yet another speaker tried to identify the question as whether any funds could be awarded in excess of the student's

need. The view was expressed that presidents of various institutions would not look kindly on being unable to present an academic award to a prospective student because of athletic restrictions. Finally, a consensus seemed to favor the awards being restricted to the student's need, with an academic honor identified by presentation of a certificate so signifying. Thereafter, discussion continued until a show of hands was taken on whether a ceiling on academic awards should be established. A close vote opposed a ceiling. A subsequent show of hands following additional discussion indicated general acceptance of restricting the awards to the top 20 per cent of a class, but without a restriction on the amount of the award.

Bob Strimer, Ohio Wesleyan, next brought up the difficulty his conference had been having with Bylaw 4-1-(c) which requires a student to be enrolled in a full-time program of not less than 12 semester hours or 12 quarter hours at the time of an NCAA competition. He suggested that rather than have the reference to 12 hours, the *minimum full time program of studies* be defined solely by the institution. He stated different calendars and academic patterns were causing his conference difficulty.

Resolution on Women's Sports

Chairman Smith reported on the resolution on women's sports which would be presented to the Convention. Extensive discussion was held on the topic. He stressed the matter was brought to the Convention without prior circularization or a survey being conducted due to the timing of the Committee on Women's Athletics and a meeting it held with AIAW representatives in the late fall. The representatives of one institution emphasized their president wished to have only one national organization conducting athletic programs for both men and women. Concern was expressed with regard to what eligibility rules would be applied to women's competition, with one delegate expressing the opinion that all NCAA eligibility rules should be applied even to initial women's championships. Another welcomed the proposals as an alternative which women's sports administrators could utilize or ignore on a campus-by-campus basis.

In response to a question concerning apparent lack of prior discussion of the matter, Chairman Smith pointed out AIAW had scheduled its convention in conflict with the NCAA's, thereby preventing women's sports administrators from attending the NCAA meetings and vice-versa.

Several athletic directors mentioned budgetary problems would result if championships were initiated during the 1974-75 academic year; others felt the director would be in a difficult position if a decision had to be made to support one or the other of the NCAA or AIAW programs. Chairman Smith stressed the Council's intention was to give each member an option of supporting one or even both.

Terminal Championships

The changing of Division III championships to terminal events, as far as NCAA competition was concerned, possibly coupled with the opportunity for Division III champions in pertinent sports to advance to federation meets at Association expense, was discussed. A straw vote indicated 44 favored and 12 opposed that concept. Then discussion was held on terminal championships without advancement to

a federation meet. A straw vote revealed near unanimous support. Support was expressed for the proposed new system of having host institutions guarantee \$200 toward the travel of other competing institutions in first round and regional competition.

Considerable discussion also was held on locating championships at central sites, particularly since the large majority of Division III membership is in the Eastern and Northern Midwest area of the country. Also, it was the desire of many for the NCAA to assist institutions participating in the championship events with their expenses to a greater degree.

GENERAL ROUND TABLE

Monday Afternoon, January 6, 1975

The session convened at 3:45 p.m., Richard P. Koenig, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer and Vice-President for Public and Alumni Affairs, Valparaiso University, presiding.

Chairman Koenig: It is my pleasure to welcome you this afternoon to our General Round Table on behalf of the Officers, the Council and the Executive Committee. The topics and the plans were developed by the division steering committees, the Council and the Executive Committee.

We are going to limit each topic to 30 minutes by agreement with the participants. It will be up to them to allocate the 30 minutes. They will take whatever time they feel is necessary to present their topics, and then will field questions.

If there are any remaining questions, we would hope that you would remember them and bring them up at your respective Round Tables tomorrow morning. We are on a tight schedule. We are going to dismiss promptly and we will move this right along.

As you listen, both at your divided Round Tables and here, and tomorrow, we would ask that you let us know that your division steering committee chairman knows what you think of this revised format.

As President Chapman pointed out this morning, it is different this year. I am sure next year's Officers would appreciate whatever comments you might want to give. The first topic has to do with women's intercollegiate athletics. You will all be very interested, I am sure, in a summary of the work of the NCAA Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics.

To present this topic, we will have the chairman of the Committee, David Swank, University of Oklahoma, professor of law and a member of the Council.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I am not sure based on some of the comments I have heard around the halls how much pleasure I have to be up here this afternoon, but I do hope it will not be any worse than when I presented the reorganization proposal a couple or three years ago. I don't think it will be much worse than what happened to me that day.

We will take off on women's sports much as you heard from Mr. Fuzak this morning in his Council report. He gave a brief summary of the action which has occurred in the area of women's intercollegiate sports insofar as the NCAA is concerned. He reported to you that we have been considering this issue for about the last 11 years.

I learned something from the staff report which I did not know. The NCAA funded a grant on the campus of the University of Oklahoma, the year before I arrived there, to study women's intercollegiate sports; and that is really where we started this whole thing.

Actually, our activity has picked up in the last three or four years with the appointment of committees of women in intercollegiate

sports. We first started meeting with the organizations then to discuss the development of women's sports programs. The first one we talked with merged with another organization that progressed into what was called the C.I.A.W., and finally to the organization known as the A.I.A.W. as it exists today.

As a result of the early meetings which we had with the HEW and the meetings of your NCAA Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Sports, and in consultation with the legal counsel for the NCAA, we removed from all of the NCAA Bylaws, Constitution and Executive Regulations, any reference to male competition. As a result of our action a couple of years ago, the NCAA championships were opened to anyone regardless of sex.

Quite obviously, there has not been a substantial number of women who have entered the NCAA championships primarily because there have been few opportunities for women to compete in intercollegiate competition in an in-season basis and meet the standards for qualification which we have set up basically on men's times.

In 1971, at the time the NCAA legal counsel recommended we take these steps to remove the word *male*, the legal counsel also recommended that we begin to provide national championships for the women, or to open our men's championships to women and have women's events.

The Committee on Women's Sports did not agree with that recommendation at that time. We didn't feel that we were ready to proceed that quickly. So we turned that recommendation down. We did not recommend it to the Council, though we reported to the Council we had received that comment. During the past three years, we have seen a very substantial growth in the women's programs on our various universities. We can ask and answer, I think, why has this occurred? To begin with, we have seen more women's competition in the high school sports programs. As these young women have graduated and come into college, they have been seeking places to compete in intercollegiate athletics. We are having to provide them. In some instances, legal action has compelled the secondary schools to begin to offer these sports programs. I think we are beginning to see some of this occur in the colleges today. Then Title IX was passed; and even though the regulations under Title IX have not been issued yet, I think it has precipitated a greater movement toward providing limited women's intercollegiate sports opportunity.

Under Title IX, our colleges and universities are putting a substantial priority upon the development of these women's intercollegiate programs. Now, the programs seemed to be developing along three various models. There is the model that develops within the existing athletic department, under one director of athletics.

We are seeing a second model develop, in which we are developing independent athletic departments for men and women. The third type seems to be a program under the existing department of health, physical education and recreation, or whatever like department the institution has on its campus, a part of the physical ed department for the women's sports program is included in that.

It is because of this diverse development and the concern that many institutions are expressing around the country, that the Council decided it should begin to take some further action.

There are some reasons for this. I think that under the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution, regardless of what happens to Title IX and the regulations under Title IX, we are not going to be able to have independent standards for men and women. The Equal Protection Clause is going to demand we give scholarships to men and to women. If we set up eligibility standards for men, we will have to apply the same type to the women.

Some legal problems, or what I think will be legal problems, will force us as an Association and as institutions to have some type of unified program dealing with the overall athletic rules and regulations, scholarships, eligibility and competition. Even if this is true, the Council doesn't believe that it should force every institution to follow the model which we are going to suggest to you today.

Obviously, there is still individual institutional autonomy; and if the institution doesn't wish to enter women in the types of events I am going to discuss with you, it doesn't have to.

If you will look at Obligations of Membership, we have an O.I. This O.I. has been adopted by the Council, but, obviously, will be needed to be voted upon by you tomorrow or the next day.

What this O.I. provides is that the rules of the Association will apply to all sports in which the member institution annually designates to the NCAA as an intercollegiate sport or in which the Association conducts a national championship. I would have to say there I think we are talking about a regularly scheduled national championship on an ongoing basis, or in which the Association draws and maintains the official playing rules.

How does that apply to the women's program? If you have a women's program on your campus in tennis, list that as one of your four intercollegiate sports you are required to sponsor under the NCAA legislation, then you would have to apply the NCAA Constitution and Bylaws.

If the NCAA prepared rules for women's sports programs—you don't at this time—you would have to apply the Constitution and Bylaws. If the NCAA offered a regional championship for women, you would have to apply the NCAA Constitution and Bylaws. Where does that leave us as far as what we are suggesting today? What we are suggesting today to you is not the creation of a regular championship for women, but the creation of pilot programs in NCAA championships for women.

The Council has directed the Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Sports to proceed as rapidly as possible with the development of these pilot programs. It has been suggested that as rapidly as possible may mean the spring of 1975. The Women's Sports Committee has not met. We have not considered any of these, but these are merely staff suggestions which the Council has passed on to us. In the spring of 1975, we offer a pilot program for women at our National Collegiate Track and Field Championships. We have a pilot program at the National Collegiate Tennis Championships. For the second year, we offer championships in cross-country, golf and possibly basketball. In the third year, field hockey, gymnastics and softball. In the fourth year, badminton, skiing and volleyball.

Obviously, it may be that we don't want to proceed that fast. It may be we don't want to proceed at all. But at least this is what

your Women's Sports Committee will be examining to determine what we shall do. We are going to meet in the very near future, and we will send out a report to the Association with the recommendations which may include providing these two championships or some championships for the spring of 1975.

We are not insisting that each institution participate in these championships if their own programs and their own campuses are not to that level or they don't wish to. They can participate in any championship which basically would be AIAW if they wish to go that route. I suppose in certain instances, if they wished to go both to the NCAA and the AIAW, they could.

I will try and anticipate some questions. What about eligibility standards for women? I emphasized that this is a pilot program rather than a regular National Collegiate Championships. The Council believes in a pilot program, the women would be eligible for the championships using the institutional rules of eligibility.

If these developed into regular championships in the next year or two, we would have to apply, if passed, this new O.I. 20; and you would apply across the board the NCAA rules and regulations to that particular sports program.

Because this is a pilot program, you would not have to count the women at this time in scholarship limitations. If these develop into a regular championship program, the women will have to come under those limitations. It may be at that time there would need to be some change of that legislation dealing with those particular sports.

We do have Phil Brown, the legal counsel for the NCAA here in Washington. I will not blame him for all the interpretations, because our Kansas City counsel also made some of these interpretations for us.

I wanted to leave plenty of time for questions because I assumed we might have a question or two from the floor dealing with this topic.

Mike Mullally (Eastern Illinois University): Are there any women on the Women's Sports Committee?

Mr. Swank: We have had two women on that Committee in the past. There have been six members, two of which have been women.

Mr. Mullally: Have you done any consultation with the AIAW?

Mr. Swank: We have had consultation with the AIAW. I will be very frank with you, we have not cleared the proposal which I have made today with the AIAW.

I am sure there will be some opposition to this position. That may be the biggest understatement made at this Convention.

Charles Samson (Texas A&M University): I am just a little confused. If No. 48 is passed, would the comments you made still apply with respect to that? It seems to me they would contradict each other.

Mr. Swank: That is why I tried to emphasize that second phrase in which the Association conducts the national championships. The Council feels that would be one that is offered on a regular ongoing basis, and for the pilot programs which we are attempting to set up would be excluded from the provisions of O.I. 20.

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): We have a fairly strong women's athletic program at UCLA. Thus far, we have not had any requests to go the

NCAA route. For those of us who do have strong women's programs, I can see when you set up a pilot program more expense and a differentiation of team representatives. As you go on into the future, they are going to want to stay with the AIAW and some other women's groups with which they are participating on a local basis. Then they can compete in the NCAA pilot program if it is successful, but having different regulations to meet one championship and having different regulations to meet this championship, if this passes.

I believe we would be better served by having the women come to us than have us do for the women what may be something they don't want.

Mr. Swank: That is why this proposal is being made. It can be considered and discussed and debated here. Obviously, this is not a proposal that has received exactly unanimous concurrence. The Council, by a majority vote, has stated they feel this is the proper way to proceed. If the Association does not, of course, they have the right to tell us we are proceeding in the wrong direction.

I think most of us on the Council do feel eventually we are going to have to have, whether we like it or not, uniform rules and regulations for both men's and women's intercollegiate sports. As long as this seems to be an inevitable fact, we might as well get on the road now to accomplishing it.

As each year goes by, it becomes more difficult to accomplish this particular goal; and it can be probably done most easily now. To be frank about it, we probably should have listened to our counsel's advice in 1971 and started at that time. We didn't. We feel it probably isn't going to help to delay any longer.

Mr. Morgan: One last facetious remark, if I may—it is going to come as a big shock to the women if they have to come to all the rules and regulations we have.

Mr. Swank: I don't think that is particularly facetious. Are there any other comments?

Fred Miller (Arizona State University): Will you explain to me the legal implications of the rulings where the AIAW may be less demanding than the NCAA rules? Where are we going as far as the future of the legal implications?

Mr. Swank: I am not sure what more I can amplify on it except if we have standards for the women that are less demanding than the standards for the men and that is challenged in a legal action, would the institution have a valid defense of sustaining those standards? Is that what your question was?

Philip Brown (NCAA Legal Counsel): I am not sure a sweeping answer would be right in either direction on that. I think there may be circumstances, differences in sections, matters of health, medical advice, et cetera, which could have some bearing in particular situations. Subject to that, I would say that any difference in rules and regulations which provided either section with an argument of discrimination would create a legal problem. I think that is what you have been stating in your preliminary remarks.

Mr. Swank: I think one thing Mr. Brown is probably referring to as differences for health and other reasons. I don't believe—this is a personal opinion—the equal protection amendment requires that

there be integrated competition between men and women. I think you can offer men's events and women's events. This hasn't been finally tested by the courts as a final analysis; but the courts seem to be moving somewhat in this direction, particularly in the contact sports. We have only had lower court decisions on this up to this time.

Delegate: Is there any chance that the NCAA would be willing to give sanction to holding its championships in conjunction with the already existing AIAW events? It would save a lot of us a considerable amount of money if we eliminate the double competition. It looks like we are creating two sets of national championships.

Delegate: I think that it might be helpful if we make sort of a division with the obligations that pertain to the NCAA under the Title IX and those that might pertain to the institutions.

We don't want to be caught in violation of the law. If the NCAA provides the opportunity for championships in male sports, under the law we will have to provide them for the female sports. However, an individual institution does not have to participate in the championships. So, the requirement for providing a team at the individual institution would not be required under the law.

The question at that point, I think, would be whether or not the institution, in the conduct of its particular athletic program, was being discriminatory against the women.

I think it would be helpful to divide that question as to the responsibility of the NCAA, on the one hand, and the effect of that responsibility on the individual institution.

Mr. Swank: I think it is somewhat difficult to divide the question as cleanly as you would like to. The institution is going to find itself in the legal bind we talked about earlier concerning the rules and regulations it will apply to the various sports programs in trying to set equal standards.

If the NCAA would insist its standards are the best and the women's organization would insist its standards were the best, the institution is caught in a bind which standard shall it comply with. I think this is one of the reasons that the Council feels that they ought to proceed in the way they are going or doing. I see I have run out of my 30 minutes.

Chairman Koenig: Thank you, Dave, for a job well done. I assure you that it is mere coincidence that we move from a discussion on women to a discussion on litigation and enforcement. It is my pleasure to present to you the three panelists. I will let them move ahead on their own.

Boyd McWhorter will report on the Special Committee on Enforcement. Boyd is the commissioner of the Southeast Conference. He is a past member of the Council, and, as I said, a member of the Special Committee on Enforcement. He will be followed by Ed Sherman, director of athletics at Muskingum College, a member of the Executive Committee, a member of the Special Committee on Enforcement and chairman of the Committee on Reorganization. Ed will be followed by Phil Brown, who has been introduced to you previously.

Boyd McWhorter (Southeastern Conference): Earlier in 1974 the NCAA Council appointed a Special Committee on Enforcement to look into the reported increase in the number and severity of viola-

tions of the NCAA regulations as they applied to recruiting and so forth. This Committee was under the chairmanship of the chairman of this panel; and it had the following members on it: Harry Cross, University of Washington; Wayne Duke, commissioner of the Big Ten Conference; F. A. Geiger, Brown University; Stark Reynolds, University of Northern Colorado; Ed Sherman, Muskingum College; J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin, and myself.

This Committee held a two-day meeting in Chicago in mid-May. We held a lengthy discussion as to whether there was any need for anything in regard to beefing up our enforcement program or investigative staff. After considering information which has been submitted by the American Football Coaches Association, the National Association of Basketball Coaches, several commissioners, representatives of the NCAA member institutions, the Committee on Infractions, the NCAA investigative staff, various media and other knowledgeable individuals, the Committee concluded, and I believe this was unanimous, there was indeed a need to do something in the area of increasing our enforcement program.

This was based on the fact that this information, which was gathered from these various sources, showed very definitely an increase in the number and severity of violations by member institutions, especially during the last four years, and the inability of present enforcement of investigative staffs to investigate and process effectively alleged violations on a natural basis and in a timely fashion, primarily because of the small number of investigators.

It was reported to us at that time that the NCAA investigative staff consisted of four field investigators and Warren Brown heading up this staff.

After discussing this matter at some length, it was determined in order to implement the program properly, the Association should employ at least six new field investigators. This would bring the total number of field investigators to eight. One would be assigned to each of the eight NCAA Districts primarily. Further, that two individuals already employed in the NCAA would be responsible for supervising and coordinating the Association's field investigative efforts, preparing the official inquiries in case of reports for presentation to the Committee on Infractions and to the Council and responding to the numerous requests on interpretation of the NCAA legislation.

The eight field investigators would be assigned to the eight NCAA districts, it being understood that the investigator so assigned to a particular district would not be restricted only to the investigation of allegations originating from that district, but would have a wide range in case he was needed elsewhere.

It was the Committee's feeling that one NCAA investigator per district would indicate to the membership that an NCAA enforcement representative was available to observe the activities of the member institutions in that district, thereby, providing a dampening effect on possible violations of the NCAA legislation. Next, it was discussed as to how this program would be financed.

You currently have an NCAA budget of \$150,000 which is designated for enforcement. It was felt that adding six new field investigators, in effect, the travel involved, and all of this, would probably

cost an additional \$250,000 per year. Many considerations were given as to what the source of this additional revenue would have to be.

It could not be a one-shot thing. Obviously it would have to be on a recurring basis and permanently provided for in the budget. As you no doubt remember, some two or three years ago, suggestions were made by various coaches and administrators that the large institutions or some of the institutions get together and pool their resources in order to collect a sizeable amount of money to undertake the increased enforcement program.

It was felt by the Committee, since enforcement was something that goes to all the institutions and not a few, the best approach to this would be through increasing the membership dues.

This is the evolution of Proposal No. 51. That basically provides for an additional \$88,000 a year. As you will notice, this amendment calls for roughly doubling what you are now paying with a realignment in dues being assigned, not on the basis of enrollment, but on the basis of visual status. The other amount, \$160,000, to bring the overall to a quarter of a million, roughly, was to come from the television revenues by increasing next year the NCAA allocation by one-half per cent, bringing the total to six per cent. Next year when the building assessment goes down, increase this to a permanent one per cent, providing each year, as it were, some \$160,000 from football television revenues to be devoted expressly and exclusively to the enforcement program.

The increase in the membership dues also is in Proposal No. 51 and is to be earmarked exclusively for the enforcement program. The Committee made these recommendations to the Council along with several others. That is why you have before you this piece of legislation. I think it goes without saying that everyone in this room is associated with an intercollegiate athletic program and has been touched in one way or another by a violation or purported violation, some obviously more serious than others.

It also goes without saying that many of these are without foundation, but an increased investigative staff can provide broad reinforcement rules and also reinforce in the minds of the American public that we are running an amateur intercollegiate athletic program. So many of the things that are said are not true, and this will help to alleviate that. There are very many, many wonderful people involved in this process.

At the conclusion of this panel, I will be willing to answer any questions you may have. I present to you now Ed Sherman who will talk to you on litigation.

Edgar Sherman (Muskingum College): During the past three calendar years, there have been 25 suits of one kind or another filed against the Association. The NCAA's position has been sustained in almost all instances. This would seem to me that legally we have adopted a good set of regulations to guide us in the conduct of our sports. The cost of this litigation has been nearly \$500,000. That is the legal cost. As you can note, in 1971, there were two cases against us; and it has grown to 25 just in a short three years. You can figure that out to be over 1,000 per cent, which is astronomical. Most people thought that after we had won a few of these cases and some legal precedent had been developed in the sports law, the

legal traffic would be reduced. This doesn't seem to be true.

This probably is because of the fact the plaintiffs have often gained some benefits in the process without any substantial costs. Some of the benefits have been temporary eligibility and publicity in their own area. On the other hand, we have gained nothing as an organization, except usually to have our positions sustained; and our costs are substantial as we fight these actions in all parts of the country.

We also gain an awful lot of bad publicity which certainly is not good for the organization. Our rules are sustained time and time again, but these become hollow victories when faced with the bleak prospect that the NCAA may well not be able to defend against so many actions in so many locales. The multiple defense costs have to be born by us while these institutions just have to bear their own costs.

Our legal counsel has advised us if this isn't stopped pretty quickly, we may have to go out of business. You must remember this is a voluntary organization. No one has to belong. The rules and regulations have to be adopted by the membership, with the obvious intent that the membership will observe it. Each member institution is the agency which must apply the rule for the eligibility of the student-athlete, not the NCAA, which too often is thought of as a big monster in Kansas City.

Finally, upon appeal by the member institution on behalf of the student-athlete, the NCAA Council or a sub-committee acting for it may restore this eligibility. In other words, there are methods of appeal. We should exhaust all of them before we take legal action. I would like to call your attention to the fact that with this cost of over \$400,000 that we are spending is deducted from the funding of other services which could be provided to the membership. In almost all cases, our rules have been determined to be both sound and right. The cost of fighting a preliminary injunction must be eliminated, or certainly must be diminished.

You have heard this morning in the report that our Reserve Fund had gone from a balance of \$122,000 to a deficit of \$300,000. What is the solution? Probably Proposals No. 62 and No. 63 would be the solutions that our legal counsel has advised.

No. 62 says that an institution must exhaust all procedures for appeal, must cooperate and must not encourage others to bring actions. If it takes legal action before taking these steps, it probably will be asked to help pay for the court costs.

No. 63 simply states that if an ineligible athlete is permitted to participate during a court restraining order and the injunction is later vacated, the Council may take optional actions—there are several listed—in the interest of restitution and fairness. These proposals would help to discourage legal actions against the NCAA in several ways.

If this is approved by a majority of the members, it would indicate that a member who sponsors litigation against the Association will likely incur the disfavor of the majority of other members, and possibly the monetary penalty should be a deterrent from premature litigation. You should note the proposal is limited in its application of the lawsuits filed before the available procedures are taken within the Association.

Now, I will turn the podium over to Mr. Phil Brown.

Mr. Brown: I can't tell you how many times in recent years I have made the remarks to Walter Byers this organization seems to have more legal problems than General Motors.

You all saw the chart that was in the NCAA News in August, which was entitled *Court Actions Keep NCAA Attorneys on Their Toes*, and the summary of prompt legal opinions involving the NCAA during 1973-74. Now, that was a good chart. For the layman, it gives a very good summary of the legal issues involved in the 19 cases that are listed on that tabulation as of August, 1974.

We prepared a recent list in our office, and there are five more significant cases that are in the courts since the August chart was prepared. This underscores Ed's points that the problem seems to be increasing rather than diminishing. To some extent, certain kinds of cases may be inevitable or standard. There may be certain kinds of injury cases or certain disputes between the NCAA and professional interests which, from time to time, will involve litigation. But there has been a real rash of cases involving requests for one form or another of injunctive relief, either initial temporary restraining orders or preliminary injunctions, which involves, first, what may be an ex-parte hearing, a hearing simply by a judge where the plaintiff and his lawyer are present only, requesting a temporary restraining order on the basis of the facts and arguments set forth in the complaint.

That is before there has been an opportunity for the defendant to become involved. Sometimes these orders are granted, and at a later date, when there has been an opportunity for a full hearing on the motion, for a permanent or temporary injunction, the order is vacated because the case has been found to be without merit. There have been a number of these cases that have come up under the 1.6 rule, and one or more recently under the 2.000 rule. Some of them come up under the extra event rules; and some have come up under the rules of professionalism, including one involving the marketing agent.

Some of the cases come up involving foreign hockey players and one case here, the Howard case, involved a foreign student rule. As Ed says, in virtually every one of these cases, after an expenditure of a very substantial amount of time and money, because these cases involved very substantial legal hours, whether they are one lawyer or another, it is the same problem across the nation; and it has added immensely to the cost that the Association has had to pay.

While there may be a single adage in the halls of the courtroom, *Love me, sue my client*, I, nevertheless, echo the sentiments Ed has expressed that the best course of action for this Association to follow is one which can hope to lessen and hopefully significantly reduce the number of legal actions that are brought involving institutions belonging to the Association or athletes of those institutions, by challenging and testing the rules of the Association prior to the completion of the administrative remedies provided within those various rules.

I don't know whether it serves any great purpose to give you any details of the particular cases. I think perhaps I should give you two or three trends. To some extent, this line of cases has been develop-

ing, can best be called the NCAA body of law. This is a dubious distinction for the NCAA to achieve; but, nevertheless, it has achieved it, and in several very significant areas. Some of these challenges have involved constitutional allegations. Some are charges that the NCAA deprived an individual of his rights under the Fifth and Fourth Amendments of the Constitution. Some of these challenges have asserted that the rules were improper use of monopoly power and violations of antitrust laws. Some of the cases have asserted that the effect of the rule as applied to an individual athlete is tortious, a wrong in the sense that he has been deprived of his right of a prospective advantage. Some of them involve just damages for other kinds of alleged negligence. One involved an agency placing students in colleges on the basis of their athletic ability. As these cases have evolved, in virtually all of them after there has been enough time for a careful hearing or a trial de novo or an appeal at the appellate level, the NCAA has successfully defended itself against these challenges.

In many of the opinions, the judges have given what I consider to be remarkably unusual and ringing statements in support of the NCAA rules. Judges did not always express enthusiasm for whatever way in which they are deciding the case, but many of these opinions would actually warm your heart to see the judge recognizes the vital importance of these rules to the educational objectives they are intended to serve.

The one rule that has been declared illegal is the foreign athlete rule in the Howard case on the basis that it was a discrimination against aliens by a separate category. The judge, even in holding that rule illegal and unconstitutional, said he was sympathetic with the problems faced by the organization but he felt there were other ways in which the same objective could be achieved without having an unconstitutional discrimination against the aliens per se.

In all the other situations, as I say, the NCAA has managed, after it has spent enough time and money, to come through with significant and ringing victories. I would hope the membership would give very serious consideration to Proposals No. 62 and No. 63. These have had the input of the NCAA general counsel in Kansas City, of ours and other lawyers, the members of the Council and of the NCAA administration. They are carefully worded to recognize constitutional rights of individuals and rights to sue, but to attempt to limit in proper ways suits that are not necessary, if members wish to support their own rules.

Accordingly, I echo the request that the chairman has made.

Delegate: No. 62 is a very sound rule, but I have some serious questions about No. 63. It deals with the activity of the institution, and it assesses the penalty when the institution brings the action itself or directly or indirectly encourages or induces another to bring it, or fails to cooperate fully in the defense of the action. In No. 63, the institution may be subjected to a penalty for an action taken by the student without its consent or cooperation. If a student is declared ineligible by the institution, the student goes out and gets the injunction. The school is powerless to avoid the injunction. They may defend it to the best of their ability, and the NCAA may come in and defend it with them; but if the court finds the injunction should

issue, the school must play. To penalize the institution because the injunction is subsequently vacated, to take money from them seems to be unfair.

Mr. Brown: My understanding on the part of those who drafted this rule, is that the intended objective is phrased in discretionary terms in order to give the NCAA Council the authority, if needed, to apply differing results in different circumstances. The basic point is that if the student is alleging a violation of his constitutional rights which is not a violation of his right and which is later determined not to be, and if the purpose of that allegation is in order to participate in a particular event in which he would not participate if he were not making this unfounded allegation, the Council can take appropriate remedial action thereafter.

Whether an institution has exercised all its obligations, to the best of its ability, is something that can vary from case to case. We have had litigation in which coaches have testified that they encouraged an individual student-athlete to compete in unsanctioned meets. I think there is at least a question if, when an individual who acknowledges under oath he is taking that kind of action, is doing all he can to uphold the rules of the institution or whether, on the other hand, he is helping to create the violation.

Delegate: I think that is well taken. I think it should be in No. 63. I think that it should state in there if the institution does not fully cooperate, the NCAA may take one or more of these measures; but it doesn't say that. It simply says if the student-athlete obtains the restraining order, and it is subsequently vacated, in any case, under the wording here, the NCAA may invoke the penalty. It would seem a small amendment that if the institution encourages this or induces the boy to bring the suit or failed to cooperate, then they may do these things. I think we should be more consistent.

Mr. Brown: I appreciate your points. I simply will observe the Council has discretion, and the facts vary significantly from one case to another and some of the remedial steps are proposed in order to be fair to other institutions.

Chairman Koenig: If you have other questions on this matter, I would urge you to bring them up to the other members of the Council or at your Division Round Tables tomorrow. In the remaining time, we want to hear a report on eligibility and very brief reports on matters of interest to the entire body which took place at the Division Round Tables.

I will now introduce to you Ernest Casale, a member of the Council, director of athletics at Temple University, who will discuss the proposal to consolidate the Bylaws.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): This proposal was not a spur of the moment idea. Actually, it is the result of a lot of discussion among the members of the Eligibility Committee, the Council and many of our athletic directors. I think also we could go into this at great length, but I will not do that at this time.

With regard to our Manual and also the different rules that we have on the eligibility and championship play, one of the things in the proposal is simplicity. Many of our problems occur because our Constitution and Bylaws are confusing. Certainly, this is true with Bylaw 4. I have dealt quite a bit with it recently.

My personal experiences through many inquiries as a member of the NCAA Eligibility Committee have convinced me we have to simplify this. I think we have to eliminate those long paragraphs and 150-word sentences.

Proposal No. 35 is written in outline form. We are talking about Bylaw No. 4 now, the differences between Article 4 and 4-6-(b) have caused many of our problems. This proposal tends to eliminate that confusion. I will be the first one to admit that sometime when you try to simplify something, it affects all of us in one way or another. I just don't think we can have simplification if we don't give a little.

The second intent is to eliminate a condition that now exists and for which there are many complaints among our members. Our present legislation allows for a team to use student-athletes during the season who would not be eligible to participate in an NCAA championship. A team can qualify for the championship in this manner and possibly prevent some other team from participating.

The point, in the opinion of some of our members, is no team should be allowed to qualify for the championship while using athletes who could not participate in that championship. Now, most of these intents were accomplished by this 4-6-(b).

As far as the transfer rule is concerned, Proposal No. 35 will not allow transfers from four year institutions to participate in the season as well as NCAA championships. Proposal No. 36 would allow for immediate participation on the subvarsity level. I realize this does not allow for exceptions that are found among some conferences and independents, but I think if the sections are worthwhile they should be incorporated in the Bylaws.

I will give you an example of a hardship case. The present regulations relating to the 2.000 rule are cumbersome and confusing. As far as I am concerned, that is pretty final. Article 4-(1)-(e) is under individual eligibility and applies to all three. It is the 2.000 high school requirement for eligibility for junior college transfers. I think there are some of our members that don't realize that there is that 2.000 rule for competition for junior college transfers for all three divisions, even though there is no 2.000 rule now in Article 4-6-(b) for eligibility for Divisions II and III.

This is confusing. For the 2.000 nonachievers the rules are the same. With the 2.000 achievers the rules are different. Actually, the institution can participate in the NCAA event, even though it allows junior college transfers who did not satisfy the requirements of the 4-1-(e) to participate during the season, but these transfers could not participate in the championship event.

Incidentally, for those conferences which are more lenient in the application of the transfer rule, there are some differences, some where you have automatic qualifiers, you have exactly in the case what this proposal is recommending. You actually have in-season eligibility rules.

If you have reviewed this proposal, you will note that Article 4-1 has been rewritten and reorganized; and the O.I.s are listed as provisions. They should be if they are that important. Comparable provisions are put together in outline form. The only real changes are in item (j).

If you will take a look at (j), you will see what I am referring to. You will see what we tried to do here, was that we tried to simplify the regulations under (j).

I know I have had as much trouble as a lot of other people in trying to define what happens to the eligibility for a student-athlete at various times in his career. What we tried to do here is to set it up what happens when he is entering as a freshman, what happens after the freshman year and what happens if he is a transfer. That is, if he is a transfer from a four-year institution and from two-year colleges.

This would help all of us who are working with this rule and regulation. Right now we are really spread out in the 4-1. Proposal No. 35 has two basic provisions. You have, the first sentence and then (A) and (B).

Part (A) refers to Article 4, Section 6-(b). That is institutional eligibility. Now, (B) is individual eligibility. That is as simply as you can put it. That means if (A) is approved, then you will have in-season eligibility. If it is not approved, you are back to the two different eligibility rules. I don't want to go into any more details on that.

Artis Davenport (Southern University): First of all, I think there is a misconception. First, you said this is a consolidation. I think that there also are changes. If it were a mere consolidation of the rules that are already in effect, then it would be easier to understand. There also are some changes.

I would also like to point to one other thing, the sub-title on the Bylaw 4 is eligibility for championship competition, yet when you made the change in (j)-3 you were dealing with in-season competition. Could you place that under the specific heading, or should this appear somewhere else in the Constitution? The main point, first of all, is that we should not be deceived into thinking this is merely a consolidation. It should be easier to understand if we merely consolidated first what we have and then separately noted what the changes are that you also wanted to have.

Mr. Casale: I have to admit it is a combination of two things. It is a consolidation and incorporating it, too. I should indicate to you what we did was try to take the severest rules in 4-6 and include it in the 2.000 rule. I would have to admit that action on No. 35 will be dependent upon the actions of Nos. 22 and 23. Nos. 22 and 23, of course, are proposals of the 2.000 rule. My point is if Nos. 22 and 23 were defeated, all the reference to the 2.000 rule in No. 35 for Divisions II and III would be eliminated. Obviously, if you don't have the 2.000 rule, it would not be in No. 35. That would have to be taken care of by the parliamentarian.

This would take care of the type of thing you are referring to, I believe. There is one provision in the provisions of II and III that I must come back to in 4-1. In Article 4-1, you still have a 2.000 rule for junior college transfers. That is still in 4-1, and it would be in this if this were to be passed. Any other questions?

Chairman Koenig: As one who has served with Ernie on the Council for sometime, I think we should be indebted to him for the many hours he has been putting in trying to bring order out of chaos. All of us know we have a great deal of confusion in trying to find our

way through the Manual. I believe if you study this outline, you will see that he has, indeed, in my mind anyway, simplified it tremendously.

We will move along now. The Divisional Steering Committees' chairmen have been given five minutes to summarize anything that they may want to present that went on at their Round Tables this afternoon. I will take them in the order in which they are sitting up here. The first one is Stan Marshall, the chairman of Division II.

Stanley Marshall (South Dakota State University): I came from a very lively Division II Round Table. I think it was productive. Our division involves institutions of diverse types and diverse programs, possibly to a greater extent than either Division I or III. Ours happened to hang on to each word and each phrase.

The things we discussed and which drew the most fire, the most interest and were the most controversial in our session pertained to the divisional criteria. There is considerable concern about several provisions in the Division I criteria that in the minds of many Division II institutions prevents them from ever having an opportunity to approve and adopt their programs and qualify for Division I status. I think they feel hopelessly boxed in, so to speak, with really very little hope of moving into Division I.

I call your attention to the Big Sky Conference Proposal No. 55. I would say in our sessions today that got the split reaction from our group. I also would draw your attention to the Proposal No. 57 presented by the Mideastern Conference. We could not help that particular conference with its problem as it sees it in basketball.

Considerable heat generated over the proposal for Division II criteria. We have had none, as you may know. We did that purposely because we didn't have a great adverse institutional program. We did submit Proposal No. 59 and even got a very strong reaction citing many, many problems for many institutions where they now have split conferences, Division I and Division II institutions, NAIA institutions, and feeling that they could not qualify for Division II status which is where they want to be.

We have to go back to the drawing board and see what we can do relative to our own criteria. Another item that drew considerable attention is the attempt on the part of the Division II institutions, at least in this case at one particular conference, which develop aid limitations designed specifically for Division II. I refer to Proposal No. 89, submitted by the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, in which they would limit the number of grants in football to 50.

Those institutions in Division II, who want to compete for the Division II playoffs, to remain in Division II and work toward Division I status would not, with this proposal, have an opportunity to compete in the NCAA playoffs to be assigned for Division II.

This group received considerable reactions with institutions with strong fall programs and with grant programs considerably above the 50 mark and particularly from those who have some aspiration of gaining Division I status but wanting also to compete in Division II while they are there. The consolidation of that Bylaw 4 which Ernie discussed did not draw as much fire as I thought it might, despite the in-season eligibility aspect. I suspect that tomorrow will be more discussion on that.

One that holds considerable interest for many of our institutions is the No. 75, designed to plug the loophole of financial aid office operation in regard to O.I. 500. Some feel it is discriminatory so far as they are concerned.

We tried today to open every topic that would come up. We hope tomorrow that we will proceed in greater depth.

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I am happy to report, first of all, that Division III had the largest attendance we have had. I guess this might be expected here in Washington. I am also happy to say that our interest was genuine in our discussion of Constitution and Bylaw items that had impact on our own institutions and similarly very little concern with those items that related mainly to Divisions I and II.

The Convention will be happy to know that we in Division III don't see any need to legislate national criteria for membership. Whether it is in size or scheduling, we think it can be taken care of at the scheduling level of each of our institutions. In Division III, we did spend considerable time on legislation. I will report on only a few items that I think concerned the other divisions.

There was considerable opposition to both proposals on satisfactory progress. Again, this is only because in our division we think that this is an institutional matter and we think it is being pretty well handled now. We don't like to be tied into a 24 or 36 or any other specific number in terms of semester or grade points, in terms of maintaining satisfactory progress. There was strong opposition to this.

There was opposition to No. 22 on the 2,000 rule. In fact, it was unanimous. I simply will report the others. No. 26, which refers to relaxation of the transfer rule for Division III, by a straw vote, a very strong favor of support for Item No. 26. Item No. 33, which as I understand it was the transfer rule, was rejected initially; but it was said that if No. 26 fails it will pick up considerably more support. We really deferred any strong expression of opinion on No. 35 until we have had an opportunity to listen to Ernie here today, and I sense from the reaction to No. 22 there will be some serious questions about part of No. 35. I assume No. 35 will be divided in the voting.

I am sort of pleased to say Division III rejected Item No. 56, which relates to upsetting the so-called championship plan. In other words, No. 56 proposes that a Division III school should go to a II and a I, one in each, and it was rejected four to one. I think it was strong feeling to let the championship program as carried in the reorganization plan have a better trial period. Similarly, and this may surprise you, No. 104, which permitted the Rules Committee to put in one-platoon football was rejected by Division III by a two to one majority in our straw voting. There was real interest at our level in all the measures that are on our agenda that relate to economy and program operation. We are just getting into this. We are very interested in the survey that is being conducted on the length of season and other measures that could help us in the fight to reduce costs. I think that is all I have at this point.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): Division I, as Divisions II and III, had a very interesting, and, I think, fruitful discussion. We started out first by discussing limiting advanced schedul-

ing. This was most interesting from our standpoint because on a show of hands at the very beginning there was a substantial indication on the part of those present that advanced scheduling in football and in basketball was something with which we should be concerned and some limitation should be established. On the other hand, when we got to the point of trying to set some kind of time limit, there was not much concurrence. Most of that support seemed to fade away.

I might add some felt this was an institutional matter and from this standpoint we did not come up with anything definitive. I should call to your attention that there is a proposal, No. 115, which is in regard to limitation of advanced scheduling on football and basketball. Nothing came out definitive from Division I but a lot of discussion.

Next, student eligibility took a lot of time. There was a great deal of interest. It was particularly in regard to Proposal No. 20 by the Missouri Valley. There was something of a divided opinion in that regard. However, in either event, I think I sensed substantial support, yet it was recognized that there needed to be a great deal of housecleaning insofar as adjusting our legislation in order to accommodate this polling. From this standpoint, it is not going to be just a simple adoption of Item No. 20 that would accomplish it.

Financial aid limitations, this has been on our agenda and will be discussed in our session in the morning. We gave brief consideration and received the report from the Special Committee on Length of Season. It was somewhat interesting to find out that this Committee is encompassing a great deal more than length of season, appropriately so, and they are contemplating sending out a survey. Our division looks forward to the questionnaire because it has importance to us in the area of economics that is confronting all of us.

We then moved into the area of legislation. We moved through about half of the proposals, spending a little time on the amateurism proposals, Nos. 1 through 5, and spent a great deal of time on satisfactory progress, both Proposals 18 and 19. I think I sensed from Division I that there is a desire for a satisfactory progress proposal, but we have not perfected the procedures yet. I am unable to ascertain whether I thought there was more support for No. 19 or for No. 18, but we will soon find out later.

I should state in regard to the 2,000 rule, it was pointed out if this does prevail, it will lead to additional interpretations in this area.

Chairman Koenig: Thank you Gentlemen.

[The session adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

HONORS LUNCHEON

Tuesday, January 7, 1975

The Honors Luncheon was held in Sheraton Hall, NCAA President Alan J. Chapman presiding.

President Chapman: It is my privilege to preside over the tenth annual Honors Luncheon and to welcome each of you. If you will please rise, I shall call upon the Reverend David Carroll, athletic representative of Boston College, to give our invocation.

The Rev. David Carroll (Boston College): We acknowledge and realize that the strength and agility of the body, the comprehensive and acuteness of the mind, are by Your gifts to us.

Help us to carry out our responsibilities to use these gifts from You in creative action.

Please instill in us Your spirit to motivate us to be great athletes, Your spirit that can renew an academic institution, Your spirit that can enliven an athletic association, Your spirit that can permeate our national government.

Please continue to direct and protect our sincere and determined President Gerald Ford.

President Chapman: Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: The NCAA traditionally has placed emphasis on the academic and extra-curricular responsibilities of student-athletes; and our program today recognizes current students who have brought academic and athletic distinction to themselves and their universities, and former student-athletes who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions.

Our master of ceremonies is an outstanding American, television personality and friend of intercollegiate athletics. Art Linkletter has been a star for nearly 40 years.

Mr. Linkletter is a graduate of San Diego State University, where he was a three-year varsity letterman in both basketball and swimming. He currently serves on the Board of Trustees of Springfield College, and that institution's swimming facilities are named in his honor.

He probably is best-known for his shows which established records for longevity. His *People Are Funny* ran on NBC-TV and radio for 19 years, and *House Party* ran on CBS-TV and radio for 25 years and was one of the top daytime shows from its inception in 1945. Mr. Linkletter also is an established author with 13 titles, including *Kids Say the Darndest Things*, which led all sellers for two years and is No. 14 on the list of all non-fiction published in the United States.

Mr. Linkletter's many civic activities have won him numerous awards, and he has been awarded seven honorary doctorate degrees.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to present a very special American, Mr. Art Linkletter. [Applause]

Art Linkletter: (Master of Ceremonies): Thank you very much, Dr. Chapman. It is a very generous introduction. As a matter of fact,

halfway through I had the terrible feeling I was dead, listening to my eulogy. [Laughter]

Unaccustomed as I am to speaking in public for nothing, I was delighted to fly across the country for this luncheon because, frankly, I am a sports buff. I have spent a great deal of my life in athletics and following athletics; and the smell of the locker room is not an unaccustomed perfume that follows me around here and there. [Laughter]

Sports have changed a little since I went to San Diego State but not too much. I was thinking of one of the changes the other day when I was interviewing Chamberlain and Jabbar. I was standing between the two of them, and I was thinking back to the days when I was all-conference center in basketball. I had to speak up so they could hear me up there.

I also remember in 1934, my final year at San Diego State, we won the championship of Southern California Small Colleges. The score was 27 to 19. That is what they score on the way to the men's room now. [Laughter] in the first half.

The swimming business has changed a little, too. I was looking back over an old backstroke record I held in 1932, and I noticed that the "B" varsity team and the girl's juvenile high school team were competing. I then came here to this luncheon and had the opportunity to meet and talk with these wonderful young athletes who you are honoring today and realize how far the athlete of today has come, not just in sports but in his recognition of a full life of service, intellectual curiosity and leadership in many other things besides sports. That is why this luncheon is so important.

I wouldn't walk across the street in Hollywood to emcee a banquet honoring Miss Live Bait Barge of 1975. [Laughter] But I would go anywhere to help pay honor to these young men who have done so much to represent the finest in American life.

Of course, everybody can't be a winner. Among us in the audience are not only former athletes and coaches, but some who are just good sports. I asked a little boy at my House Party one time what a good sport was. He was only about eight. He said, *A good sport is a guy that can't run, can't swim and can't throw a ball; and he can't do anything. The only thing left for him is to be a good sport.* [Laughter] There are a lot of us good sports around.

Ladies and gentlemen, this program, as you know, is going to be spent primarily in the introduction of a number of recipients of awards. First, I have two special introductions. First, a man who tomorrow concludes two years of superior service to the NCAA as its Secretary-Treasurer, who has been a guiding force in reorganization of the Association and who President Chapman tells me has been a great strength during their period in office. Give a nice welcome for Richard P. Koenig from Valparaiso University. [Applause]

Before the luncheon he tried to convert me to Lutheranism and I worked on him as a Baptist. [Laughter]

This next gentleman, in 1975, will reach a mark of 28 years service to intercollegiate athletics, a leader and an innovator, Mr. Walter Byers. [Applause]

We have two special guests in our audience from Congress today. I should like to have you meet them. Congressman Jack Kemp of

New York and Congressman Carlos Moorehead from California. [Applause]

The NCAA Honors Luncheon recognizes three distinct areas of intercollegiate athletics, and it is significant the first part of our agenda focuses upon the outstanding Postgraduate Scholarship Program.

There were 80 recipients chosen for awards this year, and I am hopeful you take your program with you for you will notice the names of these outstanding student-athletes listed on the inside back cover.

We have a former Postgraduate Scholarship honoree on the dais today, and he will be presented by Dr. Robert F. Ray, Dean of the Division of Extension and University Services at the University of Iowa, who was President of the NCAA in 1964 when this program was initiated. Dean Ray, if you will now take the podium, we will have the first presentation. [Applause]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. Linkletter, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: Each of us may take great pride in the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Program. In order to win a Postgraduate Scholarship, a student-athlete must have earned at least a 3.000 or "B" accumulative grade point average for three years of college work and performed with distinction in his sport.

We have honored many distinguished Americans at these luncheons, Presidents of the United States, justices of the Supreme Court, Senators, members of Congress, distinguished representatives of the media and the world of entertainment, astronauts, generals, diplomats and leaders of business and industry.

Through the Postgraduate Scholarship Program, we, as educators and athletic administrators of intercollegiate athletic programs, express our faith and our respect and confidence in the scholar-athlete as the citizen of tomorrow. We know that he has the self-discipline and other qualities necessary to earn a varsity letter while demonstrating academic excellence. To many, we know, will come opportunities for leadership.

Since 1964, the NCAA has awarded 737 scholarships, and represents an investment of \$737,000 in our nation's future. As we knew it would, this investment is paying superb dividends, all spelled out in the career successes of our NCAA scholars.

In previous years, we have invited representatives of the current award winners to the Honors Luncheon; and their eloquence has been some of the best in the annals of intercollegiate athletics. This year we thought it would be appropriate to invite back an awardee of seven years ago. His career, since being chosen a scholar-athlete, gives testimony to what all of us hoped would be the fulfilled promises of this program. His name is John Field Scovell. He comes from Texas Tech University. His institutional host today, and I am going to ask him to rise now, is J. T. King, director of athletics at Texas Tech. [Applause]

I would like to tell you just a bit about John Scovell. To me, he epitomizes the student-athlete concept. He had an outstanding athletic and academic career at Texas Tech University, and he is rapidly earning a reputation for ability in the management and development of real estate properties.

Mr. Scovell was graduated first from the School of Business Administration in 1968, and he captained and quarterbacked the Red Raider football team which finished second in the Southwest Conference.

He holds membership in four national honorary fraternities. He served as president of Phi Delta Theta social fraternity and was a National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame Scholar-Athlete Scholarship recipient.

Mr. Scovell earned a master's degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. While at Harvard, he served on the Student-Faculty Committee on Methods Instruction. At Tech he was chosen Distinguished Military Student and Battalion Commander.

He began his career with Arthur Andersen & Company and was a senior accountant with the firm before he became associated with Woodbine Development Corporation, a company founded in 1973. Now he is president of that corporation. He also serves as vice-president of Hunt Investment Corporation.

In addition, he shoulders many civic responsibilities. He chairs the Athletic Staff Dinner Committee, serves on the Team Selection Committee and represents Texas Tech as a director of the Cotton Bowl Athletic Association. He is a member of the Chairman's Council of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, the prestigious Dallas Salesmanship Club and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes.

Mr. Scovell serves on the Associate Board for the Business School of Southern Methodist University and participates in the sustaining membership drive for the YMCA.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us give a warm welcome now to John Field Scovell, who will respond for all 773 NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship recipients. ([Applause])

John F. Scovell (1968 Postgraduate Scholarship Winner): Dean Ray, thank you, sir. President Chapman, Mr. Linkletter, it is indeed a pleasure to be here, especially an honor to represent the prior Postgraduate Scholarship winners.

I don't really know which is the more difficult task, to adequately represent these prior recipients or to properly thank the NCAA. Let me try to tackle that first one. I stand before you today representing the scholars, the Rhodes Scholars, the educators, lawyers, dentists, businessmen, scientists, architects, all with a common denominator, athletics.

Tens of thousands of young men and women compete in inter-collegiate athletics each year, and a very small portion of those people enter professional athletics as a career. Instead, education becomes that foundation. Fortunately, in that regard we have the NCAA, which is providing an outstanding program for these people.

You will be interested to know that on the average 27 per cent of these scholarship recipients move into the field of medicine; another 22 per cent into the legal profession, and another 10 per cent into business.

As scholarship recipients, we thank you for this program. Certainly, it has been of great benefit to each of us. It has given us national recognition, financial help and an incentive to seek higher education.

Let me turn now to the more difficult role. How do I properly

thank the NCAA? You have provided help for over 700 athletes in obtaining postgraduate degrees. You have invested three-quarters of a million dollars in higher education for the youth of America. Certainly, for these things we thank you; but I think our real gratitude transcends this generosity.

The NCAA is the backbone of a great American institution, that's the hero. Yes, stars, idols and heroes, these are the people that affect and change and alter the lives of the youth of America. We are indebted to the NCAA for this program. America thanks you, the NCAA, for providing this type of leadership and program.

Through the member institutions, you provide training grounds and teachers for these heroes. These are the heroes to whom the young people of America look up and after whom they pattern and model their lives. Certainly, in that regard we are thankful to each and everyone of you.

I would like to close by saying that it has been a pleasure to represent the former winners and to come before this group and thank you in behalf of my fellow recipients. They join with me in saying thank you, first, for the heroes which you have provided for us after whom we have modeled and patterned our lives and, secondly, for the educational opportunity and the motivation you have given to attain that goal as one of the heroes for the youth of America of tomorrow.

We thank you. [Applause]

Mr. Linkletter: Thank you, Mr. Scovell. I would like to talk to you after the Luncheon about some investment opportunities. [Laughter] Of course, fame is fleeting all of these men on the front row of famous athletes. Fame comes and fame goes. I have been on the air for 40 years and on the way through the lobby a lady came up to me and said, *Didn't you used to be Art Linkletter?* [Laughter] Those kinds of things hurt.

Another one we get that I love, *Oh, look, there goes what's-his-name.* But the one that really cuts happened to me in Chicago last week. I was there giving a talk; and a lady walked up to me and said, *You are Art Linkletter?* I said, Yes. She said, *You are better looking alive than you are on TV.* [Laughter]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is time for us to start the awards ceremonies, and I believe that our special guest of honor is here to join us.

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

[The assembly rose and applauded.]

That warm welcome, Mr. President, is not for just our highest elective official but to perhaps one of the most accomplished athletes of Presidential history and certainly the only American President to establish a sitzmark record on the ski slopes of Vail. [Laughter]

A very important part of the NCAA's Honors Luncheon is College Athletics' Top Ten. This is the program that gives this Association an opportunity to identify the top five outstanding senior student-athletes of the preceding calendar year. It recognizes five distinguished former student-athletes on their silver anniversary as college graduates.

Each NCAA member institution nominates its top senior student-athletes and a former athletic standout for these prestigious honors.

The criteria is very interesting: athletic and academic achievement and distinguished service. In other words, you might say mind, body and spirit.

The NCAA is honored by the presence of the College Athletics' Top Ten, and we now salute them for their achievements and contributions.

May I present Today's Top Five honorees to you at this time. When I mention your name, will you please stand and be acknowledged by the audience. Following a brief resume of your collegiate career, which will be accompanied by some motion picture highlights, please come to the podium to receive your award.

First, from the Pennsylvania State University, football star John A. "Jack" Baierunos. His institutional representative is director of athletics, Edward M. Czepak. [Applause]

Pennsylvania State University long has stressed the overall campus responsibilities of its student-athletes, and the career of Jack Baierunos insures the future of this tradition emphasizing academic and athletic excellence.

A three-year starter at center, Jack has helped the Nittany Lions to Sugar, Orange and Cotton Bowl appearances. Twice an all-East and academic all-America selection, Jack received all-America recognition as a senior.

He also excelled in the classroom. The Dean's-List student compiled a 3.45 grade point average as a pre dentistry major in the college of arts and sciences. In other words, as you can see, he has spent three years knocking teeth out and he will spend the rest of his life fixing them. [Laughter]

Jack received the Delta Upsilon award for scholarship, and was selected to Micron Delta Kappa Honorary. A leader on and off the football field, Jack captained the Nittany Lions and also served as president of Delta Upsilon fraternity.

He won a Scholar-Athlete Scholarship from the National Football Foundation, and he also is an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship recipient.

Jack Baierunos, please come to the podium for your award from Mr. Koenig. [Applause]

From the University of Southern California, hero of the Rose Bowl, Patrick Capper Haden, ladies and gentlemen. He didn't do badly in the Notre Dame game either. His institutional emissary is faculty athletic committee representative Dr. E. John Larsen. [Applause]

It is easy to understand why John McKay considers Pat Haden one of the most outstanding quarterbacks in Southern California's rich football history. He has directed the Trojans to three Pacific-8 Conference championships, three Rose Bowl appearances and a national championship. And it is just as easy to understand why Coach McKay considers Pat one of the most outstanding student-athletes in Southern California's athletic history.

This Rhodes Scholar has earned a 3.7 grade point average majoring in English. So how come when he got the award at the Rose Bowl he said, "We love you, Baby." [Laughter]

Pat is all-America away from his campus environment. He has donated considerable time to underprivileged children, working in joint educational projects, YMCAs and other youth organizations;

and presenting playground clinics at least twice each week in the summer for the Athletes for a Better America program.

He has established many Trojan total offense and passing records, and has been the Pacific-8 Conference leader in each of these categories. He also was a team captain and an academic all-America selection.

Pat is a Football Foundation Scholar-Athlete and an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship recipient. He is going as a Rhodes Scholar next fall to England, and will be coming back here in the United States for law school. If history repeats itself, he will be appointed to the Supreme Court in 1985. [Laughter]

Ladies and gentlemen, Patrick Capper Haden. [Applause]

From the University of Alabama, football player Randy Lee Hall. His institutional representative is Paul "Bear" Bryant. [Applause] Randy looks like his neck size is 24. [Laughter] He is a big boy.

Alabama has been ranked No. 1 in the nation much of the past two seasons, and Randy has been outstanding at defensive tackle leading the Crimson Tide to three Southeastern Conference championships with a 32-1-0 overall record, and Cotton, Sugar and Orange Bowl appearances.

Randy was a two-time All-Southeastern Conference honoree, academic all-America and captained the Crimson Tide. The pressures associated with a National Championship football team probably have become routine for Randy Hall the past three years.

He is aware of the pressures of becoming No. 1 in the classroom. Listen to this. The Phi Beta Kappa honoree has earned a 3.64 grade point average majoring in biology with a minor in chemistry.

His name has become routine on the Dean's List, and he has been elected to Omicron Delta Kappa Senior's Men's Honorary and Alpha Epsilon Delta pre-med fraternity. He also is active in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes. I want to commend him for that. That is such an important, great organization.

Randy has received a Scholar-Athlete Scholarship from the National Football Foundation and an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship.

Ladies and gentlemen, Randy Lee Hall will now receive his award. [Applause]

From the University of Michigan, wrestling star Jarrett T. "Jerry" Hubbard. His institutional representative is director of athletics, Don Canham. [Applause]

Few intercollegiate wrestlers, if any, have had greater success in NCAA competition than Jerry Hubbard. He won the 150-pound event his junior and senior seasons, after finishing second in the National Collegiate Championships as a sophomore and fourth his first year in this competition.

Jerry also won three Big Ten Conference titles and one second-place medal for the University of Michigan. You can see him on the screen dressed in black. During his career, the Wolverine captain won 77, lost eight and had one tie, and established 12 school records.

He visited military bases and hospitals in the Far East on a goodwill tour co-sponsored by the United States Pacific Air Forces and the NCAA in the summer of 1973. Jerry also was a champion in the classroom, establishing a strong "B" average in the College of Education.

He was selected to the Sphinx Junior Honorary and Michigauma Senior Honorary, and was a member of Omega Psi Phi fraternity. Jerry is currently utilizing his wrestling expertise and outstanding leadership qualities to teach and coach at Joliet, Illinois, West High School.

This is the winner in person, ladies and gentlemen, Jerry Hubbard, University of Michigan. [Applause]

From the University of North Carolina, track star Tony G. Waldrop. [Applause] His institutional representative is track coach Joseph Hilton.

Everyone recognizes Tony Waldrop as one of the premier athletes participating in track and field by virtue of his world indoor mile record. But at the University of North Carolina, he is recognized equally for his leadership qualities. In fact, Coach Hilton insists he has never had an athlete work harder to insure team success.

Tony has earned indoor and outdoor track and cross country all-America recognition. He won the NCAA indoor 1000-yard and one-mile run championships, five Atlantic Coast Conference individual titles, and he placed second in the 1500-meter run at the World University Games. Now, get this, he ran seven consecutive indoor sub-four-minute miles, and nine straight in outdoor competition. He was selected the Atlantic Coast Conference Athlete of the Year in 1974.

Tony has been dedicated to hard work in the classroom. The political science major graduated with a 3.4 accumulative grade point average. A former Eagle Scout, Tony was named a Morehead Scholar at North Carolina, and he was the Patterson Medal honoree, recognizing the most outstanding senior athlete.

The Dean's-List student also was the recipient of a Firestone Scholarship, and he is currently pursuing advanced degree requirements at North Carolina on an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship.

Ladies and gentlemen, Tony Waldrop. [Applause]

At this time, I would like to present to you the Silver Anniversary Top Five, recognizing outstanding former student-athletes on their 25th year after graduation.

Gentlemen, will you please rise and remain standing at your place when I call your name. Following a brief resume of your collegiate and post-college careers, you will receive your awards. We have some films. Where some of you were competing before it was actually motion picture film, we have postcards and slides. [Laughter]

From Southern Methodist University, a four-letter man in football, basketball, track and baseball, now the chairman of the board, Robert S. Folsom Investments, Incorporated, Robert S. Folsom, ladies and gentlemen. His institutional representative is director of athletics Dick Davis. [Applause]

It did not take Robert Folsom long to demonstrate his quality and versatile athletic talents at Southern Methodist University. As a freshman, he was the football team's leading scorer and pass receiver. He tied for first in the high jump in the Southwest Conference Championships; and earned basketball and baseball letters.

Southern Methodist University followers knew the next three years would pass all too quickly for their gifted four-sport threat, and they were anxious to see what he would do for an encore. But they had to wait two years. Mr. Folsom transferred to the United States Mil-

tary Academy for his sophomore and junior seasons of eligibility where he earned letters in football and basketball.

Mr. Folsom returned to SMU and lettered in football and basketball, but he sustained a broken leg which prevented him from participating in track and baseball. SMU's last four-sport letterman captained the football team and also served as president of Kappa Alpha fraternity.

Mr. Folsom excelled academically, too. He was selected to Blue Key and Cycen Fjor at SMU and ranked in the top 12 per cent of his West Point class.

He began his career in real estate investment following graduation, and organized his own company four years later. Today, Robert S. Folsom Investments is one of the largest land development and real estate investors in shopping centers, office buildings and apartments in Dallas and Fort Worth.

Mr. Folsom serves on the Board of Directors of the Cotton Bowl Athletic Association, the Dallas Mercantile National Bank, Guardian Savings & Loan Association and the Metropolitan Dallas YMCA. He is an SMU and Methodist Hospital of Dallas trustee, and is a past president of the SMU Alumni Association, the Mustang Club and the Dallas Independent School District.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to present to you now for his award, Robert S. Folsom. [Applause]

From Vanderbilt University, football, basketball and track star, now the president of Memphis State University, Dr. Billy M. Jones. His institutional representative is director of athletics Clay Stapleton. [Applause]

Billy M. Jones was an outstanding athlete, and he had a rather unusual college career because he was married during his undergraduate career and had to have a full-time job to support his wife. So all he did was to barely find enough time to letter in three sports at Vanderbilt, win the Tennessee state long jump championship twice, earn selection to Phi Alpha Theta and Omicron Beta Zeta fraternities and have his classmates name him Best All-Around Male Student on the campus. Think what he could have done if he had remained single. [Laughter]

Dr. Jones transferred to Vanderbilt from San Angelo, Texas, Junior College, where he had earned all-America recognition in football, captained the basketball team and twice won the state long jump championship.

He began his professional career as a mathematics teacher and coach at Nashville's Hillsboro High School where his football team established a 100-30-4 overall record, and his basketball teams won 93 and lost 23, including four championships and a fourth-place finish in the state tournament.

He joined the faculty at Middle Tennessee State University as a history instructor and assistant football coach. He became a member of the Texas A&M University football staff five years later.

Dr. Jones left coaching and returned to San Angelo Junior College to become head of the history department. He pursued a doctorate in academic administration at Texas Tech University, then joined the Angelo State University faculty where he was selected the outstanding teacher in Texas colleges and universities.

He became president of Southwest Texas State University in 1969, and was named president of Memphis State University in 1973. Dr. Jones serves on the American Council on Education board of directors, and the National Advisory Panel of Air Force ROTC.

He is an advisor to the Liberty Bowl Association, president of the Texas State Historical Association and Governor Dolph Briscoe's appointee to the Texas State Historical Survey Commission; and he has been selected a Piper Professor and a Fellow of the Texas State Historical Association and the American Council on Education. He has also authored two books.

A busy, happy, successful man, an athlete that we are honored to present today, Dr. Billy M. Jones. [Applause]

From the University of Cincinnati—now, I will get into my old sport, swimming—here is the president of the CINCINNATI ENQUIRER, Incorporated, William J. Keating. His institutional representative is director of athletics Hindman Wall. [Applause]

William J. Keating has had a long and distinguished career in public service; and he is utilizing the varied experience he has gained as a lawyer, judge and Congressman meeting his responsibilities as chief executive officer of Cincinnati's only morning newspaper.

Mr. Keating was a four-year letterman at Cincinnati and earned points each year in the Central Collegiate Swimming Association Championships. He was the team captain and recorded the nation's second fastest time in the 100-yard breaststroke his senior season, but he finished second in the event to an NCAA record time. He was the Indiana and Ohio breaststroke champion, and also lettered one year at Purdue.

He was a member of Sigma Chi fraternity, and twice was president of his Cincinnati Law School class. He worked to finance his education. That is something to think about these days.

Mr. Keating began his career as the State of Ohio's Assistant Attorney General, and then two years later he became judge of the Cincinnati Municipal Court, where he served seven years, including three as presiding judge. He was elected to the Hamilton County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court for a three-year term, and then to two terms on the Cincinnati City Council, where he was majority leader and chairman of the Finance Committee.

Mr. Keating was elected to the 92nd United States Congress in 1970, representing the First District of Ohio—serving there with him was Congressman Ford, now President Ford. Incidentally, his constituents gave him 69.4 and 70.1 per cent of the vote in his two Congressional elections, many of them voting several times. [Laughter] That assures me a good review in the Cincinnati paper. I want to see if you were still listening. [Laughter]

He was a member of the powerful House Judiciary Committee and the House Select Committee on Crime. Mr. Keating participated in facts-finding trips to Attica State Prison after the riots, and traveled to Israel to assist the immigration of Soviet Jews. He resigned from the Congress to become president of the 448,000 circulation CINCINNATI ENQUIRER in 1973.

Ladies and gentlemen, we bring you now a man who has distinguished himself in every field that you can think of in civil and civic life, William J. Keating. [Applause]

From Butler University, basketball star and now general agent for the Franklin Life Insurance Company, Ralph E. O'Brien. His institutional representative is director of athletics Tom Warner. [Applause]

His nickname, by the way was famous in athletics; but few nicknames overshadow an individual's given name after he disappears from active competition. There is speculation around Indianapolis, Indiana, even the most ardent enthusiast would not recognize Ralph O'Brien as the former two-time basketball all-America from Butler University; but mention "Buckshot" O'Brien and everybody knows him. He fires from every angle. [Laughter] Youngsters in his hometown may not know he twice was named the most valuable player in the Mid-American Conference, or that Mr. O'Brien once held all the Butler School records. And it is doubtful many would know Mr. O'Brien was president of his class and a student council director. They probably would not know he received the Hilton Brown Basketball Award for academic and athletic excellence, leadership and all-around campus activities. And the Andy Williams Award—are you a singer, too [Laughter]—as the senior athlete who displayed the most outstanding academic, athletic, leadership and character qualities.

It is not common knowledge Mr. O'Brien graduated in the top 10 per cent of his class, but youngsters and adults alike can tell you what Mr. O'Brien has done for his city's youth. He is the founder of the Indianapolis Boys' Club and has supervised construction of two club centers. Mr. O'Brien is director of the First Baptist Church Recreational Program. I knew there was something about you I liked. [Laughter] Ralph, let's take up a collection. [Laughter] He initiated this Program and has coached in the Tabernacle Recreation Program the past 12 years.

He is also a member of the Indianapolis Boys' Club Association and the Indianapolis Junior Basketball Association Board of Directors. He is active in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and serves on the Better Sports Committee for the City of Indianapolis. Mr. O'Brien is past-president of the Butler B-Men Association, and he is the assistant state chairman and county chairman for the Heart Fund.

Mr. O'Brien holds every honor club award sponsored by Franklin Life Insurance Company, and he has ranked second nationally in sales 11 times in his 20-year career, earning selection on the Million Dollar Round Table the past 19 years.

He is a great salesman, a great athlete and a fine citizen, Ralph "Buckshot" O'Brien. [Applause] He will be in the lobby on your way out with application forms and health examinations. [Laughter]

From the United States Naval Academy, football, lacross, basketball, the commanding officer of the USS Hancock, Captain Philip Joseph Ryan. His institutional representative is Captain J. O. Coppege, director of athletics. [Applause]

Captain Ryan's professional career has not surprised anyone who knew him as an undergraduate. In fact, these individuals would insist it is a natural extension of his four years at the United States Naval Academy.

Captain Ryan earned four letters in football, captain of the team, played in the East-West Shrine Game and was presented the Thompson Trophy, recognizing the midshipman who has done the most to

promote Naval Academy athletics. He also was a two-time all-America in lacrosse, played in the North-South Game and was recipient of the most valuable player trophy. He also earned a basketball letter.

His leadership abilities were reflected early as a member of the Brigade. Captain Ryan served as a battalion commander and president and vice-president of his class.

He began his career as a naval aviator and operated from such renowned aircraft carriers as the USS Point Cruz, the USS Silcoy, the USS Forrestal and the USS Enterprise. And he has had shipboard duty on the USS Monterrey, the USS Mulinix, the USS Spiegel Grove—you couldn't find a ship you liked [laughter]—also the USS Shangri La, the USS Norfolk and the SS Juneau. Anyway, there are more of them here.

He served as the Deputy Commandant of Midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy prior to accepting command of the USS Juneau and the USS Hancock respectively.

Captain Ryan has been awarded the Legion of Merit, two Distinguished Flying Crosses, the Bronze Star, eight Air Medals, two Navy Commendation Medals and a Navy Unit Citation.

Ladies and gentlemen, Captain Philip Joseph Ryan, United States Naval Academy. [Applause]

The Committee has asked two men to respond on behalf of the honorees. First, on behalf of Today's Top Five honorees of senior students, Mr. Randy Hall of Alabama will make the response.

Randy Hall (University of Alabama): Mr. President, distinguished officials, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: On behalf of Today's Top Five Scholar-Athlete Award Winners, I should like to accept this tremendous award. To me, this award means more than honors received for just purely athletic ability. This shows the relationship between the two major areas of our collegiate lives, academic and athletic.

The complimentary relationship between these two things has been shown so successfully by such lettermen as President Ford, the Supreme Court Justice "Whizzer" White, and so many other leaders in so many other areas of our nation.

This award shows that some of us can come to college not just to excel or participate in various sports but, more importantly, to excel in academics and gain an education. This is the main reason for going to college. There is a small minority of us who can make our living the rest of our lives solely from our athletic ability. This is why education is so important for most of us.

There are so many people that we need to thank. We need to thank the NCAA for allowing us to accept this award, the Postgraduate Scholarship Committee who voted for us and nominated us, our coaches, our professors and teachers all through the years and our parents. Personally, I would like to thank Coach Bryant who has done so much to help me, just nominating me for this award and so many others, my parents, who taught me so much all my life and my wife, who has given me so much encouragement. But most of all, I would like to thank God who made it all possible. [Applause]

Mr. Linkletter: Thank you, Mr. Hall. Responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Top Five will be William J. Keating from Cincinnati.

William J. Keating (University of Cincinnati): Mr. President, distinguished guests: I just want to comment that after you have played football you became a Congressman, but it wasn't until after he was a swimmer that he became President. [Laughter]

On behalf of Bob Folsom, Southern Methodist; Dr. Billy M. Jones, Vanderbilt; Captain Philip Ryan, United States Naval Academy, and Ralph "Buckshot" O'Brien, Butler, I want to express appreciation to our respective universities for nominating us and also to the National Collegiate Athletic Association for honoring us as Silver Anniversary Award winners.

I should like to also congratulate the five student-athletes for scholastic attainment and athletic ability. I thought as I sat there, we are 25 years out, and when these young fellows are 25 years out, we will be 50 years out. That is kind of an alarming thought. Undoubtedly, 25 years after graduation, it is quite an honor to be remembered much less to be recognized for having any athletic ability at all.

This is truly one of the most significant events in my life and one that imposes a great sense of humility and pride. Unquestionably, one reflects upon the impact athletics has upon his life, the discipline, the competition, the honesty of effort, the lasting friendships, the camaraderie, all that comes from participation in sports, that prepares an individual for his career and develop the ability to work with and for people from all walks of life.

The sense of accomplishment from winning and the humbleness of defeat broadens each individual's experience and prepares him for the success and the adversity to be encountered in this later career. Participation in sports has been the most influential factor in my life. The identity and recognition provided me an opportunity that one with my background otherwise could not have received.

On behalf of the other recipients and myself, I thank you for the honor you have given us, hoping that we can be worthy of the designation. And we commend you, gentlemen, for the work you do in preparing others on a daily basis for their future assignments in this, the greatest nation in the world. [Applause]

Mr. Linkletter: Now, it is my pleasure to call upon the President of the NCAA, Dr. Alan J. Chapman, Rice University, to present the Association's highest honor, The Theodore Roosevelt Award.

President Chapman: Thank you, Mr. Linkletter. It is indeed a privilege to make this presentation of our highest award, the Theodore Roosevelt Award, named after President Roosevelt because of his concern which led to the formation of the NCAA in 1906. His strong advocacy of physical fitness and the benefits of competitive sports are well known.

Other winners of this prestigious award are printed in your program, but I want to take a few seconds to read this impressive list of names to you: President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Supreme Court Justice Byron White, Former Purdue University President Frederick L. Hovde, Dr. Christopher C. Kraft Jr., United States Ambassador Jerome W. Holland, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley and Jess Owens.

Before presenting the award to President Ford, let me briefly remind you of its purpose. The award is presented annually to a promi-

nent American who played in competitive athletics, has by his continuing interest and concern for physical fitness and by the example of his own life exemplified most clearly and forcefully the ideals and purposes to which college athletic programs and amateur sports competition are dedicated.

In view of this criteria, there is no doubt but President Gerald R. Ford deserves this award. He played center on two national championship football teams at the University of Michigan. He was the Wolverines most valuable player his senior season, and played in the East-West Shrine and College All-Star games.

His distinguished career of public service in Congress is well-known, and they need not be repeated here. Mr. Ford's entire public service career is dedicated to the goals of freedom, equality and competitive fair-play for all Americans. He has brought honor and prestige to his state, university and to intercollegiate athletics.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with a great sense of pride and humility, I present the Theodore Roosevelt Award to the President of the United States. [The assembly extended President Ford a prolonged, standing ovation.]

Gerald Ford (President of the United States): Dr. Chapman, Art Linkletter, distinguished honorees, ladies and gentlemen: At the outset let me congratulate John, Pat, Randy, Jerry and Tony for their outstanding athletic record and their superb achievements in the field of academic standing. I wish each and everyone of you the very best as you begin your careers, on behalf of yourselves and your country.

May I say to Bob Folsom, Billy Jones, Bill Keating, Ralph O'Brien and Captain Ryan, the very best to you for what you have done, the record you have made; and I wish you, along with the others, the very, very best.

Dr. Chapman, may I most sincerely thank you for this award and for the goodwill and the good wishes that it represents. It will always occupy a very honored position in my office, in my life and obviously in my memories. I am most grateful.

I want you to know that I feel very much at home here today, because if you stop to think about it, the athletic director of any college and the President of the United States have a great deal in common. We both need the talent. We both need the cooperation of others if we are going to succeed. We both get a lot more criticism for the losses than we get credit for the wins. We both buy aspirin for the six-pack and we both have a certain lack of permanency in our jobs.

As one coach put it to me—I was talking to one of them recently—he did not mind so much the fact that his name on the office door was written in chalk, it was that big wet sponge that was hanging beside it. [Laughter] I am sure I don't have to tell any of you in this audience particularly the problems of being an athletic director or a head coach. For instance, I have seen my good friend "Bear" Bryant down here. I was talking to "Bear," and he said we both had the very same experience on New Year's Day. I said, *How is that possible? I was skiing, and you were at the Orange Bowl.* He said, *That's what I mean. We both hit the top and after that it was all downhill.* [Laughter]

You know, I think Alabama played a superb ball game, but Notre

Dame just seemed to have something a little extra. You could tell, as I watched it anyhow, that Notre Dame was feeling pretty confident. I heard later they brought in Earl Butz to give the blessing. [Laughter]

It was once said that many of Britain's battles were won on the playing field of Eton. We can always say, and I think those of us who have had the experience can say it with great conviction, that amateur athletics has developed much of the muscle that has built and defended and will continue to defend this country. And though a young person might not go to college, no youngster grows up in America today without some competitive sport.

Sports are not only a preparation for life, their spirit is part of the very essence of the American competitive system.

We have a saying in my old home state of Michigan, as the lakes, rivers and ponds freeze over, the sight of eager children skimming over the ice is a very common one; and if you ask a young boy or a young girl how he or she ever learned to ice skate, the answer out our way is very, very simple, *I got up when I fell down.* It is my judgment that we have got to get up here in America. As a nation, we must be physically and mentally fit because the times demand that we not only compete but that we excel.

And we must do it with enthusiasm, the enthusiasm found more prominently on the fields of sport.

Emerson once said, *Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm.* This is a time for greatness in our nation, and especially for enthusiasm. In this spirit, Dr. Chapman, I accept the National Collegiate Athletic Association's 1975 Theodore Roosevelt Award. I accept it not for what I might have achieved in the past, but for what I will strive to accomplish with the help of all Americans in the future. Thank you very much. [The assembly extended President Ford a prolonged, standing ovation.]

Mr. Linkletter: Thank you, Mr. President. Now, to accept the institutional Theodore Roosevelt Award is Marcus L. Plant, professor of law, and faculty athletic representative at the University of Michigan, who, by the way, was President of the NCAA in 1967 and 1968. [Applause]

Marcus L. Plant (University of Michigan): Mr. President, Mr. Chapman, ladies and gentlemen: It is indeed a high privilege to participate in these proceedings as the representative of the University of Michigan. On behalf of the students of the university, the faculty, our administrative officers, particularly the president of the university, Robben Fleming, I accept this plaque. It will always occupy an honored place on our campus.

The University of Michigan shares the pride of all of the members of the NCAA in the excellence of our intercollegiate program in the United States. It is relatively rare nowadays that one hears the suggestion that there is some basic incompatibility between the athletics and the other parts of the educational program. To some extent, I think the public has been well educated by the National Collegiate Athletic Association in these award ceremonies in which the outstanding products of our educational system have been brought to the attention of the public.

We have always had the philosophy for those who are interested

and for those who have the capacity to absorb its benefits, the intercollegiate athletic program has a broad educational value and contributes with all other phases of college life to the intellectual development and the spiritual growth of young human beings. We, on the campus, see evidence of this every day as represented by the fine young honorees who are with us today. We also see evidence of the soundness of this philosophy in the lives of those who have been graduated.

We at Michigan are intensely proud of the man who has been the recipient of the NCAA's highest award. The Michigan faculty has been proud of him for a long time. We were proud of him when he was captain of our football team and the most valuable player, entirely apart from the win-loss record of that season. [Laughter] We have looked with great satisfaction upon his distinguished public career.

It is entirely befitting that an award that bears the name of President Theodore Roosevelt should go to one who has devoted for so many years his energies and his dedication to the service and benefit of the United States.

Speaking for the University of Michigan, indeed I dare say, speaking for all people of goodwill in the United States and throughout the world, Mr. President, we congratulate you and we wish you well. [Applause]

Mr. Linkletter: Thank you very much, Professor. Before going into the concluding ceremonies of this luncheon, I am sure the President of the United States may have other things to do at the White House. We will thank you very much for having been with us this long and having accepted this great award.

President Ford: Thank you very much.

Mr. Linkletter: Ladies and gentlemen, this has been a memorable occasion for me. I want to thank the NCAA for asking me to serve as master of ceremonies. These kinds of awards are much more meaningful, in my view, than the valuable player awards or Heisman Trophy or any other trophy you can give to an athlete.

I congratulate each of today's honorees, and I congratulate the NCAA for its wisdom in planning this kind of award. [Applause]

President Chapman: Mr. Linkletter, the NCAA sincerely appreciates your taking time from your tremendously busy schedule to serve as the master of ceremonies for our tenth annual Honors Luncheon. Everyone here today certainly is cognizant of the outstanding contributions you have made to our society and the genuine interest you have shown in the advancement of education.

This has been a grand occasion for each of us, and I hope this NCAA Silver Bowl will provide you with many fond memories of this day in the future.

Mr. Linkletter: Thank you very much.

President Chapman: After Father Carroll officially closes our program with the benediction, we will prepare for the final business session of the Convention.

The Reverend David Carroll (Boston College): We thank You for the opportunity of making these wonderful award meetings.

We thank You for our master of ceremonies, Art Linkletter, and his humor.

We thank You for the understanding, knowledge and insight You give to our President, and we thank You for Your presence here today with us.

BUSINESS SESSION

Tuesday Afternoon, January 7, 1975

The Final Business Session of the 69th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order in Sheraton Hall at 3 p.m. by NCAA President Alan J. Chapman.

11. OPENING REMARKS

President Chapman: We will come to order, gentlemen. As part of the great drain on our resources, as was mentioned earlier, was legal expenses. We did invest in a gavel this year rather than the tapping with the traditional ash tray. [Laughter]

As I mentioned yesterday, only those with the white badges and the blue badges may have access to the floor to speak on propositions. The pink badges and the goldenrods are not so privileged, except there is one exception which I have to mention. Ralph Fadum, North Carolina State, is a member of the Council. He may speak from the podium, but he may not speak for North Carolina State from the floor.

We have checked the Constitution, and it is possible to do some legislation by a temporary nature with a resolution. Resolutions do not have a submission deadline. Some are being submitted now. There seems to be a great interest in resolutions. In fact, the Council is working on one concerning the women's athletic question. These will be passed out tomorrow morning when you come in.

If you will remember, our usual order of business is then to consider resolutions as the last item. That will come sometime tomorrow afternoon. I have been informed there will be more resolutions, at last three more besides those that you have with you; and these will be presented at the end of the legislative proposals Wednesday afternoon.

12. ACCEPTANCE OF THE REPORTS OF THE COUNCIL AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President Chapman: Before turning to the legislative proposals, I would remind you that we did not adopt the Council and Executive Committee Reports because they refer to the minutes of the meetings that are contained in your Annual Reports; and I wanted you to have time to read those. I am now in a position to entertain a motion to accept those reports.

[The motion was regularly made, seconded and approved.]

13. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

President Chapman: You will find the first five proposals will all be of a similar nature dealing with amateurism. These really are proposals that resulted from a Special Committee on Professional Rulings, chaired by Lou Myers; and Lou will present each of these five.

Amateurism—Scholarships

Louis Myers (University of Arizona): I move for adoption of Proposal No. 1, which amends Constitution Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(3).

[The motion was seconded.]

As you will note, Proposal No. 1, as well as Proposals 2, 3, 4 and 5, are sponsored by the NCAA Council and are based upon recommendations of the Special Committee on Professional Rulings. Last October, the Special Committee recommended to the Council clarifications and in some instances revisions of several existing official interpretations concerning amateurism rules.

This was principally to eliminate any possible distinction between the applications to aliens and to United States citizens and to include inappropriate applications of these rulings to athletes who have participated on teams sponsored or administered by outside amateurism organizations.

October 22, 1974, the Council adopted the Special Committee's recommendations; and in a memorandum dated October 25, 1974, the revised interpretations were circulated to the membership. These revised and clarifying interpretations are now submitted for your review.

The intent of Proposal No. 1 is to confirm the existing interpretation that a student's acceptance of scholarships and educational grants-in-aid administered by his educational institution does not jeopardize his eligibility at NCAA member institutions, high school, prep school, junior college or senior college.

Herbert Gallagher (Northeastern University): Am I to assume, sir, from this item that a lad in a foreign country, who has acceptable educational benefits, not administered by this institution, would be ineligible if he comes to one of our institutions in the United States? If I am to assume this, and I do from the way I read it, I don't think after the boy is in our institution in the United States it would hold up in court.

Every time we seem to speak we worry about legislation. I think this is a perfectly fine item of legislation to affect the secondary school boy that comes to us from the United States. I think it is completely unacceptable as it affects the foreign student.

Mr. Myers: The Committee and the Council will agree that it is necessary that any educational expenses given to an athlete be administered by the institution regardless of the level of that institution in order for us to exercise control over the administration of that type of aid. I cannot comment on the legal implications, however. I assume that you were referring to an outside amateurism sports organization.

Mr. Gallagher: Yes, sir.

[Proposal No. 1 (page A-1) was approved by show of paddles.]

Amateurism—Definition of Pay

Mr. Myers: I move adoption of Proposal No. 2, which amends O.I. 1, following Constitution 3-1-(a)-(3).

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 2 is twofold: It more clearly defines pay in accordance with the current Association practice and permits an athlete to receive from the outside amateur sports team or organization actual and necessary travel expenses related to practice and game competition.

As you probably recall, current expense regulations permit only actual and necessary expenses on game trips as indicated in the current O.I. 4.

[Proposal No. 2 (page A-1) was approved by show of paddles.]

Amateurism—Employment by Professionals

Mr. Myers: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 3, which amends Constitution Article 3, Section 1-(b).

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 3 is to specify that the prohibition against employment by professional sports organizations shall apply only when the individual's athletic skill or participation is a factor, rather than for any purpose whatsoever as is now the case. In other words, an athlete is not a pro simply by his association.

[Proposal No. 3 (page A-2) was approved by show of paddles.]

Amateurism—Professional Team Definition

Mr. Myers: I move adoption of Proposal No. 4, which amends O.I. 4.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal No. 4 is twofold. It revises the present definition of a professional team to preclude unjustified application of the Association's professional rulings. The strict application of the present O.I. 4 will render professionalism to outside teams and leagues in various sports, as well as sports programs administered by national amateur sports organizations resulting in ineligibility of athletes participating in those programs, when, in fact, such athletes may not have engaged in any activities or received any compensation which would justify their recognition as professional athletes. The proposal also is designed to permit an amateur team or playing league to receive the developmental funds from a professional organization, provided that such funds are channeled through a national amateur sports administrative organization.

[Proposal No. 4 (page A-3) was approved by show of paddles.]

Amateurism—Ice Hockey

Mr. Myers: I move the adoption of Proposal No. 5, which deletes O.I. 5 and O.I. 6.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this Proposal is to delete the two O.I.'s which are specialized interpretations regarding the sport of ice hockey. These interpretations are not necessary in light of your approval of Proposals 1 through 4.

[Proposal No. 5 (page A-3) was approved by show of paddles.]

Amateurism

Dick Gibney (Boston University): Boston University would like to request that Proposals 6, 7 and 8 be withdrawn.

President Chapman: Technically, everything that appears in your Convention Program is properly before this Convention. Is there anyone in the assembly that does not wish the items to be withdrawn and wish to vote on them? Hearing none, then we will declare them withdrawn.

[Proposals Nos. 6, 7 and 8 (pages A-3 and A-4) were withdrawn.]

Amateurism—Ice Hockey

Mr. Gibney: At this time Boston University would like to move to substitute Proposal No. 136 in place of Proposal No. 7.

President Chapman: I am advised by the parliamentarian that Proposition No. 136 is out of order as a result of the passing of Item No. 1. Proposition No. 136 is an official interpretation applying to the Constitutional article as it appeared before it was amended. It

has now been amended and this is not a proper interpretation of the now new existing one.

Mr. Gibney: We feel we have an important proposal that speaks directly to the problem of ice hockey here in the United States and Canada. We feel that it is very difficult, a very difficult situation.

We submitted this proposal to the Council two or three months ago, and we only learned this morning that it was out of order. If this is going to be the ruling, we would like to make an official appeal to the floor to overrule the parliamentarian.

President Chapman: The ruling of the parliamentarian and the Chair on Proposal No. 136 is that it is out of order. Your proper motion is shall the Chair be sustained by a vote of the assembly.

[Proposal No. 136 (page A-69) was ruled out of order. Motion to overturn ruling was defeated by show of paddles.]

Amateurism—Summer Expenses

Boyd McWhorter (Southeastern Conference): Because I feel the language in No. 9 is not consistent with the intent and it does not take into consideration what the intent says it does, I will ask the Council to reconsider it with the possibility of an amendment; or we will have some disposition to make of it.

President Chapman: What that amounts to, he is not going to move No. 9. Does anyone else want to make the motion, or it will be withdrawn. I presume in this evening's Council meeting, we will consider Boyd's request that we reconsider it and amend it and bring it back tomorrow.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): I move we table this proposal until tomorrow morning.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Complimentary Tickets

Kenneth Herrick: (Texas Christian University): I move that Proposal No. 10 be passed.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 10 does two things, I believe. One, it clarifies what has always been the intent, namely, that tickets be given only to players in the particular sport in which they participate.

The second part makes it possible for those schools, primarily Division I schools, to buy the tickets at the face value from their players. The reason for this is one of the areas that is abused the most. Some of the schools may not have this problem; but a great majority of Division I schools find that interested alums, businessmen and others are always standing around ready to buy tickets at more than the regular purchase price.

This does not compel any school to repurchase the tickets, but it permits those of us who are concerned about this problem to alleviate the particular problem. It may be, too, that this is a question that the group would like to have divided. If so, we will be happy to acquiesce in that.

[Motion to divide Proposal No. 10 (page A-5) was regularly made, seconded and approved. The first sentence was approved by show of paddles.]

President Chapman: We now have before us the second portion. Is there any discussion on it?

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I would like to speak in favor of this for those who issue complimentary tickets. I would like at this time to say that the University of Arkansas is going to submit for consideration tomorrow a resolution which I would like to read at this time briefly so you can be thinking about it. The coaches feel this is an area that we should consider at this Convention.

No complimentary tickets shall be provided directly to the student-athlete; no tickets purchased by a student-athlete shall be provided directly to him. Complimentary tickets, as well as those purchased by the student-athlete must be presented and picked up by his parents or his friends at the gate, and the friends or the parent must identify themselves at the gate as they sign for them.

I want to speak on this for just a minute. If the student-athlete is not going to use his tickets, invariably he will take them and use them downtown with a ticket broker who is a representative of athletic interests. He will pawn them off to the alumni who are seeking tickets for a particular game two or three days before the game. If we could purchase these back and get this resolution passed, that would eliminate the problem.

Carl James (Duke University): I have one question I would like to pose to Frank. I think I agree with the gentleman from Texas Christian, that the intent of the complimentary tickets was for those student-athletes participating in the sport in season; but I also believe the intent was to provide for the student-athletes' parents, family or friends to see them play.

I can see a real problem here in the athletic departments buying back tickets from student-athletes, particularly when the NCAA allows the maximum of four. I can see a tremendous pressure on the coach to now award all four tickets to all of the people who dress, therefore, causing additional problems in having to come up with better tickets and putting the pressure back on the athletic department now to subsidize all 70 or 80 people who are dressing. At \$8 per ticket, that is an additional \$32 per athlete per game.

I don't believe this is the intent. I would be against buying the tickets back from prospective student-athletes.

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): I would like to ask a question. If the athlete is getting maximum aid—room, board, books, tuition and \$15 a month—will the amount he gets for the tickets be deducted from the maximum aid which he is receiving?

President Chapman: Well, that will be an interpretation that the Council would have to deal with if it is passed. Prior to four or five years ago when this particular provision was in the Constitution, it didn't speak to the question of buy-backs; but some Conferences did have buy-back policies and were ruled as being permissible until this rule was rewritten. At least one time it was so interpreted. I can't answer you anymore than that.

[The second sentence of Proposal No. 10 was defeated by show of paddles.]

Permissible Expenses

George Ilg (California State University, Fresno): I move for adoption of Proposal No. 11.

[The motion was seconded.]

John Mahlstede (Iowa State University): I move adoption of No. 137, which amends No. 11, Constitution 3-1-(h)-(1).

The amendment inserts a phrase *if provided for in the Bylaws* after the word *or* in No. 11.

The intent is to implement legislation making it possible for each Division to adopt its own or similar Bylaws relating to the payment of expenses of an athlete's wife to a post-season football game or an NCAA championship.

[Proposal No. 137 (page A-69) was approved, 154-130.]

President Chapman: You have before you amended No. 11.

George Fisher (Austin Peay State): I did not attend the Division I Round Table yesterday afternoon. Why is this proposal limited only to football?

Mr. Ilg: Yesterday we discussed this in the Round Table and the answer given then would be the same today. The traditional football bowl season is during the Christmas vacation. We have a longer period of time at that time of the year, and we felt we should limit this proposal to football alone.

Mr. Fisher: I think it is rather facetious because I have not seen the students miss any games because of classes.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I did not go to a bowl this year, darn it; but I just don't believe that we are really looking at the issue here. If we are going to have football bowl games—I don't know about basketball; I know about football—it is going to be hard to get a team to vote to go to a bowl game if the wives can't come. This slipped through last year, and the Council made an amendment or something to get the wives to go this year. When I was in Jacksonville, I wanted to see if the wives were there with the Texas team. They were. They said they had adjusted it.

Let's face facts. If we are going to have bowl games, wives need to go. I would like to ask if this could be a Division I vote.

President Chapman: No, this is a Constitutional provision. It is not available for divisional vote.

Mr. Broyles: It is important, I promise you this, if we want to continue bowl games.

President Chapman: You are right. This was considered last year, and it was a moment of relief in that Convention as I recall.

Richard Chewning (University of Richmond): I would like a clarification. It is my understanding that as the motion has now been amended. If we approve Proposal No. 11, that does not allow what we are voting on to occur until we get to Proposal No. 12. Is that correct?

President Chapman: Yes. Proposal No. 12 is a Bylaw.

Mr. Chewning: Is that not allowed to be voted upon by divisions?

President Chapman: Correct. You can consider No. 11, as amended, if it passes, as enabling legislation for No. 12.

Keith Broman (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I would like to make this one point. I believe it has been traditional for many years that the wives of football players go to bowl games. I think it was a technicality last year that caused the whole situation to arise. I would like to appeal to the conscience of those people in voting for this, recognizing that this historic fact would be prejudiced; and I think Frank Broyles has brought it out pretty well.

Mr. Broyles: Since No. 12 can be voted on as a Bylaw and can be voted upon by division, why wouldn't it be good conscience to give everybody in each division the right to vote on Proposal No. 12—to pass No. 11 so we can speak as divisions on No. 12?

[Proposal No. 11 was approved as amended (see No. 137) by show of paddles.]

Postseason Football Contests

John Mahlstede (Iowa State University): I move Proposal No. 12, amending Bylaw Article 2, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (c) be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to reaffirm the present practice in Division I covering the cost of sending eligible players' wives to attend football bowl games.

[Proposal No. 12 (page A-6) was voted upon by Division I only and approved by show of paddles.]

Bill Ireland (Nevada, Las Vegas): Division II playoff games still are called the Pioneer Bowl, etc. How do we interpret all those bowl games? Are we included in Proposal No. 11?

President Chapman: Well, you are included in No. 11, in that it is now permissible for Division II to adopt something in the Bylaws in this connection. But No. 12 is adopted only by Division I, so Division No. II cannot take any vote on the proposal.

Mr. Ireland (Nevada-Las Vegas): I understand this, but under No. 11 can't we take it?

President Chapman: No, not unless it is so provided by the Bylaws.

Permissible Awards

Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): In behalf of the Council, I should like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is an amendment to the Constitution, which simply makes it allowable to increase the permissible awards from \$100 to \$200. I might say there has been no change in this limit in the past four years; and, as we all know, there has been inflation. This is simply an opportunity to increase this award to take into consideration the fact that we have had inflation.

[Proposal No. 13 (page A-6) was approved by show of paddles.]

Eligibility for Championships

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I wish to move the adoption of No. 14, and then amend it with Item No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

I now move to amend No. 14 with No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last year in the Convention, this Proposal No. 15, which you also have to take into consideration in discussing No. 14, came before us. At that time a number of us got up and objected to Item No. 15 because we felt it permitted the wages of psychological warfare on student-athletes a few hours before post-season tournaments.

We have had that experience in Long Beach. Mr. Morgan, of UCLA, spoke after I did and said they had gone through a similar experience. Several other members of the Convention spoke and No. 15, which is before us later today, was turned down exactly in the

same language, by the Convention last year. We felt at that time, as we feel now, with No. 138, that rather than have a helter-skelter picking out of a particular student-athlete it would be better to have a simple procedure—like filling out a registration card or a Social Security card—that every student-athlete that goes into an NCAA sponsored tournament would automatically fill out that card within a week of the particular championship. That is to save the NCAA paperwork.

What we are suggesting in No. 138 is each institution have such a card or a format to be specified by the NCAA Executive Committee so there would be one nationwide form for such an affidavit. The student-athlete could sign it, and it could be kept with university athletic representative. If the question ever came up, he would merely have to refer and assure that that card had been signed. The reason we say format is so you don't even have to buy the forms from the NCAA, you can run them off on a mimeograph machine. The purpose of that amendment is to inform the student-athlete prior to the sponsored game that he has to reaffirm his amateur standing.

Members of this Convention all know cases have come up, especially in basketball in the '70s, where unbeknownst to the coach, the institution or the teammates, some players have signed professional contracts and have gone into post-season competition, with the latter being found out to the detriment of the teammates, coach and institution.

J. R. Davis (Oregon State University): I want to ask a question of President Horn. Why should the format be signed the week of a championship? I look back to the NCAA dates and sites schedule; and I find that school would be out for baseball, golf, tennis and outdoor track. It might be very difficult to administer if that form had to be signed by the middle of June. I would hope that there might be some consideration in signing that at a different time.

Mr. Horn: I would hope the NCAA would make some reasonable interpretation of that if the academic year were over and certain meets came up at a time when it is difficult to contact the athlete.

[Proposal No. 138 (page A-70) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Earl Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I speak not so much in opposition to this, but the thought that we may have choices that provide better approach to this important problem. I think we all feel we need individual certification as well as institutional certification. I think the question is how we accomplish it. One of the important issues involved, I think, can be found in the issue whether we seek this individual certification for NCAA championships alone, or whether we seek it for general eligibility.

You will notice in No. 47, which we will be taking up presently, you are calling for an annual individual certification for eligibility. This amendment seems to have gained a great deal of support among this group. I personally see no reason why we need to distinguish between general certification on a nationwide basis and certification for championships.

Assuming our approval of No. 47, No. 15 coming up next seems logical. We would not need to go through the routine of securing general approval for championships. The Executive Committee, as-

suming the approval of No. 15, could move on particular cases where information was at hand where the eligibility or the amateur status of particular athletes might be in question. We could move swiftly in those relatively few cases and not have to move on a national front in the establishment of this individual certification for the championships.

Mr. Horn: I would certainly support No. 47, but that is an annual certification of eligibility which would probably occur at the beginning of the academic year if it is run like the chief executive certification. The problem comes in the senior year or the junior year where you have particularly hot prospects in basketball, and the negotiation takes place unknown to the institution and the athletic staff sometime in February or March. Take basketball, where the known instances are that a student-athlete has signed and then goes into a postseason tournament.

The fact of the matter is when the Basketball Committee, in the early '70s, challenged both Long Beach and UCLA players on this. The athletes, to my knowledge, had not signed any such professional contracts. But, again, it leads to the potential for the evil in No. 15. I think it is just a lot simpler not to have that annual certification but get it right down before the tournament and make sure everybody signed it. That way we are not having newspaper stories printed, and everything else, with all these allegations that hurt the players in the tournament. I think we ought to be here to help the players in as simple a manner as we can.

Let me say I hope the format would remind the student what the rules of eligibility are, especially in relation to professional contracts. Let's say he had signed it a week before the tournament and it later was discovered that he had also signed a professional contract—perhaps before he signed it or between the week and the signature and the tournament. I would hope that he is making \$100,000 or \$300,000 a year by this time with the pros, and the institution and perhaps the NCAA would have some legal recourse to go back to that student and collect a little bit of his pro money to pay all the net receipts that the institution has to return to the NCAA.

As the administrator of an institution I realize what we had. Last year in this Convention, Mr. Duke said he thought it would be possible for the Executive Committee to take the position Mr. Morgan and I have taken in the implementation of this proposal. In other words, if we gave them the authority to go and make selective signature prior to a tournament, he thought the Executive Committee could adopt it to everybody. The Convention agreed.

They turned down their selective authority, and yet the Council comes in this year with the same old proposal.

[Proposal No. 14 (page A-6) was approved as amended (see No. 138) by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 15 (page A-7) was withdrawn.]

Outside Competition

David Busey (Lycoming College): Speaking for the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reason for this amendment is that the fact there still are some colleges and universities which have open call for practice, and the

students will report and may be with the team until even after the season has started. Then they are cut from the squad or they are dropped from the squad, feeling they are unable to make the team.

What we are saying in this amendment and the intent is to make these boys ineligible, if they should participate in outside competition in his sport, to become a member of his institution's squad or team in that sport during that season.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): I speak in behalf of the Council in support of this proposal. We think it is good in that it does not penalize the good athlete more than that one year.

[Proposal No. 16 (page A-7) was approved by show of paddles.]

[Proposal No. 17 (page A-8) was withdrawn.]

Satisfactory Progress

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference) In behalf of the Pac-8 Conference I would like to move consideration by the Convention of the change in the order, and Proposal No. 19 be considered before No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is our feeling that No. 19, while basically quite similar to No. 18, is written in greater detail. It deals with, we believe, every aspect of the satisfactory progress rule which we feel is acceptable to the membership and does not necessitate, in our view, the additional issuance of official interpretations in the future which we feel would be necessary under No. 18.

In addition, we feel also that in light of the amendment being offered to No. 8, there should be conference consideration under the hardship provisions of No. 19.

[The motion to change the order was approved.]

I should like to move for approval of Proposition No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to ask Professor Harry Cross to give up the position of parliamentarian at this time and to speak to this amendment.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): This proposal is one which our conference has evolved as being a workable and a better satisfactory progress rule than we have had in the past. One of the objections made last year at the Convention identified the youngster in the sport which began in the winter semester, winter quarter, that sort of thing, at a relative disadvantage to pick up his progress as compared with the one who has the sport in the fall where he would have the summertime to do it.

This proposal, as you will notice, identifies the calculation of whether the progress has been made is to be at the beginning of the autumn term each year. If he has progress at that time his eligibility under this requirement applies to the whole year. It doesn't call for a recalculation at a later time. The proposal recognizes there are institutions that do not have an ordinary quarter-credit or semester-credit approaches and permits institutions with perhaps the innovative-type program to meet the requirements of this sort by, in effect, having 20 per cent of the normal graduating requirements for the year on the assumption that 12 units will give one-fifth of the whole year of the whole academic program.

Because 12 and 15 are not universal identifications of the full proportionate or a full load, this is put in terms of satisfying 80 per cent of the annual requirement. This comes out to the same percentage,

but it recognizes that you may have either more in your particular institution or less. The question is merely as it hits the 80 per cent level, which is the same as the 12 is compared to the 15 under our patterned required load to be eligible during the season of competition.

The other aspect of it, while it looks perhaps rather complicated, does identify and provides for the sorts of questions which do arise, such as what to do with the removal of an incomplete; what to do with the forceful limit, or something of that sort? They will be treated as identified in this proposal.

I am sure you will notice part (f). Now, the Big Eight Conference had, and I think still has, their own progress rule and recognizes there are some hardship situations that need to be accommodated rather than having just a flat situation of once you are caught no way to get out of it.

There is one other feature to this that I think our conference felt would be a desirable one. It is necessary that you meet the 12 unit rate of 80 per cent of normal load rate, as well as meet the requirement during the preceding year. In other words, there is a pressure out of this that there really be progress, and you cannot in a sense move off one year and now come back and be all right. If you goof off one year, you have to somehow or other overcome that goofing off by scheduling yourself up to 12-unit average all the time.

The calculations basically talked about the regular academic year. The averaging of the regular academic year as well. But there is some time available in effect, you might say, three years in regard to the averaging. Summertime work can be used in increasing the academic year, to get the required progress.

James Drinnon (University of Tennessee, Chattanooga): I am not sure I understand paragraph (a). Does it mean if the athlete earns 11 units for the fall semester, he would not be eligible in the winter semester?

Edward Bennett (Washington State University): No, he would put himself in perhaps an embarrassing situation the following year. If you go to paragraph (d), you will notice the calculation is made at the beginning of the autumn term; and if he has made his progress at that rate of calculation, he will have satisfied this rule for that whole academic year.

Al Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I think the clarification the man from Washington State made might be in order. I think one of the reasons this was included is to take care of the young man, for example, who enrolls for, let's say, 12 units and withdraws from three units later on. That puts him in the position where he must go to summer school and pick up those three units.

If a student-athlete passed 10 hours in the fall semester and 10 hours in the spring semester, then four hours in the summer school, as I read this, he has earned 24 semester hours during the preceding 12 calendar months. He also has averaged 12 units for each academic period of the regular academic year, excluding summer periods. Is that correct?

President Chapman: Yes, he would be all right.

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): I wish to point out the particular difference between No. 19 and No. 18, because it does bear

on the question of No. 19. Part (b) of the No. 19 allows for the termination of eligibility for students that enter in an institution midyear, whereas, No. 18 does not.

It should be pointed out to the Convention that those students who would enter from a high school or a junior college transfer midyear would not be eligible the following fall unless they can take 24 credits in one term, which is unrealistic. I think we ought to recognize there is that difference.

Let me respond to the earlier question. If you have a student who entered your university in the fall of '73, you are on a semester system and you are concerned about his eligibility next fall in '75, he will have to be in your institution for two academic years or four semesters. He, therefore, must have completed four times 12 or 48 semester credit hours on this accumulation criteria. It is just as simple as that.

He can obtain those 48 hours credit by going to school during a combination of regular semesters or summer sessions.

Fred Shabel (University of Pennsylvania): I rise in opposition to No. 19 for the same reason that I talked against Item No. 18 yesterday during our Round Table discussion. I would like to remind Pacific-8 and other institutions that would like to have satisfactory progress rules, that we believe you should have one if you so desire. We have already heard enough problems and questions regarding satisfactory progress, which indicates in the strongest way that institutions are crying for institutional autonomy. I thought we had learned our lesson last year when we really didn't want to accept satisfactory progress and we, in effect, said to our membership that it is an individual institution problem.

I think we have heard enough reasons in the last few days to take normal progress, tuck it away and not allow a national athletic organization to dictate the academic programs on individual campuses. I really would not like to go back with the normal progress rule and dictate these rules to the deans and to the academic guidance people who have the responsibility for making these ultimate decisions, particularly with all of the ramifications we have already heard, and the problems. I do leave with you this thought. Turn it down but recognize that conferences and institutions can most certainly put in their own programs.

Thomas Martin (Roanoke College): I speak to the academic institutions that are on some type of academic schedule. We are on a four-one-four system, which means that the student will take nine credits a year or 36 for graduation. Under the 80 per cent, this means a student takes a normal load which will be nine courses a year and must pass eight of those nine courses under his system to be eligible for competition.

We do, for the sake of transferring of our students to other institutions, break down into a semester our equivalent which is four hours for each unit they take at our institution. Working on that basis, it does not work a hardship on us, that will be all right; but I do think in terms of the four-one-four situation, it creates a situation. We could have students with a B+ average, who failed two courses but doing fine in seven others, would not be eligible under this program.

Gene Clayton (Methodist College): Am I right in assuming a

freshman who enters school in January will be required to go to summer school in order to get the 24 hours, or would he be covered in section (f) under the hardship of 12 hours?

Mr. Davis: I would say he would be covered in section (b).

Mr. Clayton: Prorate progress at 12 units per academic period?

Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Clayton: How about a student that passes less than 24 and then passes 17 the first semester? In other words, can he become eligible in the middle of the school year?

Mr. Davis: No.

Edward Betz (University of Pacific): I am in favor of the progress rule of the Pacific-8 Athletic Conference. We have had a rule that has worked for us, and it simply calls for the passing of 24 or 36 units between the beginning of the seasons of competition. We have had no problem with this rule.

I understand that the supporters of No. 19 do have problems in some of their schools with a similar rule. I suggest rather than forcing some of the rest of us to change our already working rules, that the conference adopt this rule for themselves and let our conference continue with our present rule.

Mr. Casale: Just one additional point. I was confused, and I possibly still am. Do you have an accumulated number of hours year to year? I assume from what I heard today, yes, it was 24 and 48. Is that correct? We have a young man that can get 21 hours the first year, make him eligible for the second, and get 24 hours the second year and ineligible for the third even though he got 24 hours? Is that correct? That is pretty tough.

Mr. Bennett: I fail to see how it is tough when, indeed, he has the summer to make up that kind of requirement. It is an accumulation of the 80 per cent of the normal, whatever your normal load may be, which answers the earlier question. It is 10 hours and then they got four, and so on.

Edward Krause (University of Notre Dame): I am just seeking information by this question. Before I ask the question, I would say that it has seemed for many years the great scandal of intercollegiate athletics has been the so-called exploitation of the athletes who play out their three or four years at a university and then do not have enough credits to graduate. This is something I think many of us would like to see put to an end. I suppose that a satisfactory progress rule is the aim of this objective.

With that as the background, I wonder about the difference in wording in No. 18 and No. 19? In No. 18, the reference is made to 24 semester hours of academic credit and in No. 19 the wording there is 12 units of degree credit work. There is seemingly a distinction between the degree credit work and the 24 semester hours of academic credit.

I just wonder in my question whether the NCAA Council, in this particular amendment, had in mind covering the requirement that an athlete has to take academic credit which does count toward his degree. As I understand the problem, you can get a lot of credits in that do not count toward the baccalaureate degree.

You could easily take the 24 hour minimum that is required here

without coming anywhere near graduation. I have not heard anyone comment on this.

Mr. Cross: The degree language you will find in a couple of places, has that inconsistency. Some of our transfer rules, for instance, must transfer degree credit to the institution. Personally, I would like the degree credit idea for the very point you make rather than just academic hours that are of no help to them at all. There is this distinction, I prefer that the progress be degree work toward graduation.

John Toner (University of Connecticut): I have two comments about this legislation, either No. 18 or No. 19. Several years ago in an attempt to develop satisfactory progress, we made a survey of our conferences throughout the country, and we found all but one of the playing conferences had a satisfactory progress rule. Without too much exception they were similar to the ones that are here before us.

Some conferences do have these rules, and the Pacific Coast seems to have one that operates for them. I know the one that I am associated with operates for us. In our own institutions, summer sessions only count in the subsequent semesters. You cannot count toward credit in the previous semesters. We do have a particular problem in trying to apply this legislation to our school.

Although I am in favor of the whole concept of normal progress, I can't, in good conscience, vote for either of these proposals.

[Proposal No. 19 (page A-9) was defeated by show of paddles.]

George Ilg (California State University, Fresno): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 18 should be amended with Proposal No. 139. The Proposal 139 actually repeats the proposal and then adds Item (f) from No. 19 to take care of hardships that would be inevitable under the existing Proposal No. 18. I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to say the content of No. 18 was presented by the Council really in response to a longstanding Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements. The concept of satisfactory progress has already been used, as has been pointed out, and it was the Committee's recommendation that we accept or present such a concept for national guidance. The result is what you see now, as amended.

[Proposal No. 139 (page A-70) was defeated by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 18 (page A-8) was defeated by show of paddles.]

Academic Standards

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): I move the adoption of Item No. 20, which amends Article 3, Section 3-(c) of the Constitution.

[The motion was seconded.]

I trust all here have read the proposal and know its contents and intent. I might further state the Missouri Valley Conference presents this proposal on the basis of its sound academic principles. It would allow a student-athlete to pursue a bonafide program of graduate or professional study upon completing the undergraduate requirements.

We asked ourselves why should a student-athlete interrupt his academic progress by not completing requirements for graduation in his fourth or fifth years of attendance just to retain a season of

eligibility for competition. This type of decision could confront a student-athlete in the fourth year. For example, since it is quite possible now to validate numerous hours of degree credit through various proficiency examinations, thus accelerating the student-athlete's progress, the fifth year student, with limitations in effect now, more often than not finds himself in a position of being there for the fifth year because of injury or illness or a hardship situation, rather than predesigned withholding from competition during one of the preceding academic years.

I should hope this would not happen. I feel we all here recognize we still are in the education business; and, therefore, why shouldn't we consider certainly seriously the student-athlete's opportunity to continue his academic progress in an orderly program manner?

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I guess economics force a lot of us to turn 180 degrees in some areas. But it has been my experience that a football player who could have graduated under the present rules and dropped a course so he could participate in the next fall semester gets one semester or nine semesters and graduates.

Under this rule he would be automatically entitled to 10 semesters under the NCAA guidelines, which means we are adding. If we have three, four or five athletes who would graduate and they are red shirts, they get 10 full semesters. Under the present rule they only get nine. Am I clear?

Eugene Corrigan (University of Virginia): Before I say anything, I would like for Coach Broyles to know the Atlantic Conference does love him. [Laughter] However, it is a practice for young men now to be able to sign a professional contract and come back and play another sport. There are so many instances—we talk so much about football—where the youngster can drop one or two courses, come back and play in the fall. What about the six or seven spring sports? We are very much in favor of this proposition.

We know we have the advantage at the University of Virginia by having graduate-students on our campus and are well aware of it, but we don't like the youngster holding back from graduation just to play.

[Proposal No. 20 (page A-11) was defeated, 200-192 (two-thirds required for approval).]

2.000 Rule

Stanley Marshall (South Dakota State University): In behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposition No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is the feeling of the Council that we should have some type of national academic standards, and at the present time Division II does not have such a standard. With the elimination of the 1.6 rule and the rejection today of the satisfactory progress provisions, we return home again with no national standard for Division II.

Many of us received considerable criticism in that regard. There was some feeling that Division I might drop the 2.000 rule. They did not.

[Proposal No. 21 (page A-11) was defeated in Division II by show of paddles.]

2.000 Rule

Raymond Whispell (Muhlenberg College): In behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 22, amending Bylaw Article 4, Section 6-(b).

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is obvious, and the reactions of Division III in the Round Table also have been obvious. I will make no further comment.

[Proposal No. 22 (page A-11) was defeated in Division III by show of paddles.]

2.000 Rule

Roy Whistler (Purdue University): In behalf of the Big Ten, I would like to move for approval of Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

This Official Interpretation was previously in the Manual under the 1.6 rule. It somehow was omitted when we rewrote the Manual and put in the 2.000 rule. We believe that this item is a good item to reinstitute because it would make possible the handling of the non-recruited athlete and give time for his grade record to be established.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): In behalf of the Council, I would like to indicate support of the Council for this amendment.

[Proposal No. 23 (page A-11) was approved by Division I by show of paddles.]

Conversion to 4.000

President Chapman: You will note at this point, gentlemen, Proposals 24 and 25 deal with the problem concerned with the earlier Council interpretation on what you do to compute the grade point average and not the institution itself. The two propositions connected with that have been submitted.

One is Proposal No. 24 by Stanford, and No. 25 is an appeal to overturn that interpretation. Unbeknownst to those proposers, the Council, in its August or October meeting, adopted a new O.I. to cope with the problem when a school refuses to do the computation. The Council has submitted that as No. 140.

We think it will be germane to the argument with keeping into grouping topically things. I would like to have a motion for No. 140 to be up for consideration at this time, and we will put it in the book here ahead of No. 24. We will have the three available propositions to talk about.

[The motion was regularly made, seconded and approved.]

We are now considering Item No. 140.

Mr. Thompson: The Council has taken some action which is contained in No. 140. *If a high school or preparatory school will not provide a student-athlete's grade point average or convert it to the 4.000 scale, a member institution may submit the individual's high school or preparatory school transcript to the NCAA Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements for certification or conversion. Thereafter, the grade point average shall be simultaneously circulated to all member institutions.*

I move the adoption of this O.I. as set forth in Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

One additional point. All of us, I am sure, have been faced with the problem of getting a grade point average out of certain high schools. This, I think, authorizes a means whereby this can be referred to the Academic Testing Committee, and we can cover that particular problem.

John Mahlstedt (Iowa State University): I don't know how you can determine whether or not a particular prep school or high school will or will not provide a conversion. If they don't respond after some reasonable amount of time, some two or three weeks, they probably will not.

It is my understanding that certain prep schools are extremely reluctant to provide these conversions. They will, however, upon repeated request, usually three or four long distance telephone calls, give it.

President Chapman: I guess in any instance where it is challenged, it has to be some justification where a reasonable effort has been made to try and get that grade point average. I also can see other O.I.s being generated.

Fred Jacoby (Mid-American Conference): I should like to point out to the delegates that No. 25, as amended by No. 141, gives a little different option. As I understand O.I. 409, each individual case will be submitted to the Academic Testing Committee.

No. 141 provides that the Academic Testing Committee provide tables. It seems to me this would cut a lot of the red tape. For example, one of our institutions this year has written 85 letters to high schools for grade point averages according to the NCAA specifications. Fifteen have been written twice and four three times. The thrust of our motion is to save time, save money and hopefully get more consistencies in the conversions.

John Larsen (University of Southern California): I question whether, in light of the recently enacted Buckley amendment, the last sentence in the Council's proposal No. 140 would meet the test of this. I suppose we could get a waiver at the required institution from the student-athlete to circulate his then cumulative grade point average to all member institutions.

President Chapman: I would presume so.

Francis Reinzo (Georgetown University): Am I to understand that last sentence, if my son applies to Georgetown University and his high school refuses to convert his transcript to a 4.00 scale, his converted grade point average by the NCAA Committee on Academic Testing would go to every institution in the NCAA, if some other institution requested it, or would be generally disseminated throughout the country? I wonder what the Constitutional grounds of that would be.

President Chapman: I presume it would be generally disseminated. He would have to give permission.

Mr. Thompson: Our Council indicates in an effort to be fair to all institutions, this sentence was put in in order to circulate it to the other institutions, so that we would not deprive any institution of any information being put out by that Committee.

Mr. Reinzo: I see no objections if the student is asked to which institution he would like it sent to as opposed to all institutions being given that information. Now, that seems to me to be a very im-

portant distinction. He could list, for example, with the college boards, 10 or 15 schools for which he would like that done as opposed to going to every institution in the country.

Alan Williams (University of Virginia): I don't think it is necessary to meet the intent of what the Council is doing to circulate what his actual grade point average is. I think it would be merely necessary to state that the following students, whomever they might be, have been determined by the Council's Committee to have met the appropriate provision without listing the exact average. That is all that is necessary.

President Chapman: That is a very good point.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Could that question be divided so that you vote on really the first sentence, and then the last sentence so we get that simultaneously distributed by the vote?

President Chapman: That would be in order, as I see it.

Mr. Swank: I move to divide the question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 140 (page A-71) was divided for voting. The first sentence was approved by each division by show of paddles. The second sentence was defeated by each division by show of paddles.]

John Harbaugh (Stanford University): In behalf of Stanford University, I recommend adoption of Proposal No. 24 that involves amending Article 4, Section 6-(b).

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale for this is that we at Stanford, and I am sure most other institutions, have large numbers of non-recruited athletes who have come from high schools or prep schools that do not use the standard 4.000 scale. Therefore, to simplify the clerical load we suggest that the faculty athletic representative be empowered to make the conversion in their cases, non-recruited efforts, and to keep on record the conversion factors at this point.

[Proposal No. 24 (page A-12) was defeated by Division I, 71-109.]

President Chapman: The Chair rules that No. 25 is now moot since we took action on O.I. 409. Therefore, No. 25 and No. 141 will not be considered at this time. That brings us to Item No. 26.

Transfer Rule

Everett Phillips (Fredonia State University): I move the adoption of Item No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would now like to move an amendment to Proposal 26, which is No. 142.

[The motion was seconded.]

In recent years, a great many students have been able to transfer back and forth between colleges and universities with no apparent loss in credits. Many years ago when a student would transfer, the admissions officer at that time would probably negate some of his previous course work at the previous institution. The students who were previously having to remain for five years are now graduating right on schedule. I think we also have to realize the fact that these students change their academic interests from time to time and seek other places in which they can get their education. The junior college

transfer can do this with no loss or penalty. He has the chance of changing his interest and can enter another institution with no penalty.

[Proposal No. 142 (page A-72) was approved by Division III by show of paddles.]

Raymond Whispell (Muhlenberg College): At first there is no question about the fact that this is a very desirable consideration. Actually, however, as you examine the proposal a little more carefully, you begin to see that there are possibilities that exist for this proposal that would be very undesirable. I don't think it can be denied that there are many individual situations that we would like to help, and this proposal meets those individual situations.

However, when you look then at the possibility that our admissions officers today are much concerned about getting transfer students to come to their institutions because they are very much interested in filling their institutions, I think from an educational standpoint this is a very sorry move and a move not considered in the right direction in education. I think one of the other considerations you have to look at, which is almost startling—I didn't realize until just this afternoon how startling it gets—the facts are that a walk-on athlete could play for Southern California football in the fall, for Fredonia State basketball in the winter, and if there happens to be a quarter system, he might even play baseball for Rochester in the spring.

Gene Clayton (Methodist College): I basically am in favor of the motion with the exception of the last part of the Amendment No. 142, which says that he is recruited by either institution. This means I could recruit an athlete to come to my institution. If my judgment could be poor concerning his ability, he might transfer, for whatever reason, financial, closer to home or whatever; and he would not be able to participate in the school he transferred to simply because I recruited him.

I feel like another school should not be allowed to recruit him, but I don't think we should penalize him for not judging his ability. That means if I recruit him he would have to sit out a year at any other Division III school.

I would like to make another point, all the athletes in Division III are paying their own ways or receiving aid.

David Ocorr (University of Rochester): I would like to point out that our institutions do not prohibit this particular student from immediate participation in many other extra-curricular activities; hence, in this particular student's total best interest, we urge passage. Thank you.

Robert Strimer (Ohio Wesleyan University): I realize in Division III we do injustice to individual students in transferring, but I feel that in this particular one we would be opening a can of worms. It would permit our students in Division III to go to a school that is having more success or more chance to go to Division III championships in addition to coming down from Division I and Division II. I would speak in opposition to the passage of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 26 (page A-13) was defeated by Division III by show of paddles.]

President Chapman: Before we proceed further, in reference to an earlier action on the 2,000 rule and inasmuch as the O.I. is going

into effect immediately, the chairman of the Academic Testing Committee requests a meeting of the Committee right after the session.

Transfers

Leon Bosch (Northwestern University): In behalf of the Big Ten, as well as the other conferences mentioned in sponsoring No. 27, I move its approval.

[The motion was seconded.]

It seems to us after some experience with the transfer rules that certain possibilities were either overlooked or just not anticipated at all. Yesterday's session provided some evidence of some of the things that are happening at the present time. It is our belief that in order to cushion some of the practices which are taking advantage of the loop hole in the transfer rule, that the one calendar year provision ought to be restored.

President Chapman: Thank you. Any other comments on Proposition No. 27? I might point out that the Council has voted to endorse that.

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): I would like to support the position stated by Leon. Although only major conferences seemingly were endorsing this proposal, I would like to remind my friends from the lower divisions that sometimes people keep recruiting after folks have arrived at their schools. A number of people seemingly get to junior colleges and wind up at other places, and this one year might be the right step on the way to preventing such action.

Cliff Speegle (Southwest Athletic Conference): I wish to make one point of emphasis about this rule. This is the only rule that is presently stated in the Manual. It gives a youngster an opportunity to transfer, make 24 hours in one semester and one summer school after he has been to an institution for a year and one-half, to go some place else and play without spending one year in residency. We have the one-year scholarship rule, and there is no relief for that young man.

I know what they are talking about, about re-recruiting on campuses. We still have not taken care of the youngster we have eliminated from scholarship opportunity at your institution. If he transfers to another institution we play, he has to stay there one year.

Leo Miles (Howard University): One more comment. We support this legislation in the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference, because we are finding out that for some reason or other some outstanding students that perform at our institution one year seem to find their ways to a junior college, and shortly afterwards to another institution performing exceedingly well. We support this very, very much.

[Proposal No. 27 (page A-13) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Transfer Rule

Walt Williamson (California State University, Los Angeles): As a member of the Far Western Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I move that Proposal No. 28 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent, as stated, permits a student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at a four-year college, to combine the credit hours earned and residence completed at the junior college and at

the certifying institution in realizing the 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours required for eligibility.

The intent of this, as I see it, also is to establish more of a uniform academic effect on this one-year residency. In many cases, it is the student's decision on an academic basis that he go to a junior college for perhaps one semester. I feel he should not be penalized on an academic decision simply because he goes from a four-year to a junior college to a four-year college. This motion does include the previous one of requiring a one calendar year between going from a four-year school to the first participation gained at a four-year school.

John Winkin (University of Maine, Orono): The Council opposes this motion on two grounds. First of all, it makes it tantamount to a no transfer rule; and, secondly, it flaunts the requirements of the transfer.

[Proposal No. 28 (page A-14) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Edward Bennett (Washington State University): Speaking in behalf of the Pacific-8 Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

We proposed this item because it had been ruled inapplicable by the courts, but we feel that it still should be approved.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): The reason the Council would like for this to stay in is because this is a matter in litigation and it is still in the courts. For this reason, we would like to leave it in the books momentarily.

Leo Miles (Howard University): Even though the matter is in court, we strongly urge the adoption of this. It may be a means by which we can save some of that legislative money that we were talking about.

[Proposal No. 29 (page A-14) was defeated by Division II, 48-54; Division III, 50-55, and Division I, 39-145.]

Transfers

Robert Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Association): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

If a young man doesn't participate in athletics for a period of two years after he attends a four-year institution, it would seem that he really is not too interested in that sport; and if he should transfer and should get an urge to participate, he certainly should have the opportunity.

Harry Troxell (Colorado State University): I should like to speak in behalf of the Council in opposition to this particular Bylaw change. The principal reason is that it is a tendency to destroy some of our current legislation.

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): There are three proposals here. I want to call your attention to the fact that No. 30 and No. 32 refer to a particular sport which could mean that a student who is cross country runner would not be considered a transfer if he went to the second institution in track. In looking at No. 32—if I am out of order please say so because it does bear on No. 30 the same way—a student could participate in football in the fall semester in one

institution and participate at least in the fall in the second institution and not be considered a transfer student under these proposals. Therefore, I would strongly oppose the legislation.

Robert Tierney (Queens College): Much of the legislation on our books tends to prohibit participation in many respects. This is an opportunity to change that, to make it possible for people to participate rather than to do it the other way around. I submit that we should approve this.

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): One of the difficulties with this proposal is knowing. How would you know whether a young man practiced in that sport? That is almost impossible to determine. If it related to compete, then I think that might be a different story.

[Proposal No. 30 (page A-15) was approved by Division III by show of paddles and defeated by Division I and Division II, each by show of paddles.]

Transfers

John Silan (Delaware Valley College): Speaking in behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 1 has been inserted there for the purpose of clarification, and No. 2, which appeared there, is in addition to that as it is written at the present time. The purpose of this is to waive the residence requirements of the transfer rule under the described conditions.

[Proposal No. 31 (page A-15) was approved in all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Transfers

Karl Kurth (Trinity College): Representing the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

In that connection, I further move the amendment to that amendment No. 143.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment to the amendment is an editorial change. The intent of the No. 32 is to combine (c), (d) and (e) and put it into a single section which will accommodate all three. As you know, Bylaw 4-1-(i) is the section that involves waivers for transfers and not penalize students who move from one institution, attend a second institution, and then return to the first institution.

President Chapman: Any further discussion on No. 143?

[Proposal No. 143 (page A-72) was approved by Division I and Division III, each by voice vote, and in Division II by show of paddles.]

[Proposal No. 32 (page A-15) was approved by all three divisions, each by voice vote.]

Transfer Rule

Donald Scaff (North Carolina Wesleyan College): I move the adoption of No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

Several of these items have been very similar and some of the information given earlier pertains to this one. It is the feeling there should be some residency requirement given to a four-year college

transfer or a student transfer to another four-year institution. Yet we feel the student who is paying his own way or getting aid only through a need factor should not have to sit down a full year at the new institution.

In the case of a student entering in the fall who participates in a spring sport, if he had to sit out a full year before he could participate, actually he would be, in essence, having to remain out of competition for approximately 19 to 20 months.

William Exum (Kentucky State University): I oppose this amendment because it seems to be a step backwards. It is regressive legislation. It is also in violation of one of the reorganization principles in which the adoption of the Bylaws of a particular division should be more stringent rather than less stringent. I think, from my reading of it, it is poor legislation. I urge the defeat of this particular amendment.

Ronald Roberts (Lawrence University): I would like to go along with this particular proposal. For the reason that we do have freshmen eligible right away to play. Secondly, Division III people, they do pay their own way where there is a need. Now, they do have the scholarship based on a need. This makes it quite something different than Divisions I or II.

The third reason is the NAIA has the same rule, which is very similar. Many times the boys make a mistake, and the college will make a mistake, too. They don't really have a chance with the NCAA school or the NAIA school. I say why not give them the opportunity to play in Division III schools instead of paying the price.

Leroy Swils (Denison University): I would have to speak in opposition to this particular amendment at this time, particularly because it would seem extremely unkindly in a period when Division III institutions, particularly the private institutions, are competing a little more intensively for students. Certainly the idea that the NAIA is not should not influence the NCAA in a decision.

Edward Betz (University of Pacific): I question whether this is applicable only to the members in Division III. It is applicable if the student transfers to Division III, but it affects Division I and Division II schools if the student transfers from Division I or Division II. If this were to read then students transferring from Division III schools to other Division III schools, then it is their business. But it seems to me that it becomes the business of Divisions I and II, also. I would like to have a ruling from the Chair on this.

President Chapman: The Chair rules you are quite correct. It should be considered by all three divisions. Any further discussion?

Raymond Whispell (Muhlenberg College): I would have to stand and oppose this proposal. At least Proposal No. 26 had some very desirable restrictions in it. Note one, the fact that athletic aid was involved in there. Another point that you needed the certification of not only the athletic director but also the financial aid officer. I think there are some items in No. 26 that were a lot more desirable than this. This has too many loop holes in it, and I rise to oppose it.

[Proposal No. 33 (page A-16) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

President Chapman: The stated hour of adjournment is 6 p.m. I have Proposals 34 and 35 yet to go, and they appear to me to be

ones requiring more than five minutes to discuss. We will adjourn at this time until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

[The Convention recessed at 5:55 p.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Morning, January 8, 1975

The session was called to order at 9 a.m. by President Alan Chapman.

President Chapman: We will come to order. Gentlemen, we have some interesting statistics. We have registered 495 voting institutions, plus 42 allied conferences, making a total of 537 voting members present. This is higher than the last high which was in January, 1973. There are 267 alternates and 112 non-voting registered members, making a total membership of 916. This is again very much a high. It was 834 the last time. There is an uncounted number of press representatives.

Before moving any further, I should like to call on Robert Frailey from American University to offer an amendment to the Memorial Resolutions.

14. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Robert Frailey (American University): Mr. President, the Memorial Resolutions Committee would like to add the following names:

Robert Bennett, Brown University
Jack Bonham, University of Hawaii
Carlos Jackson, Bowling Green State University
Charles Kruzan, State University of New York at Albany
Kenneth Loeffler, LaSalle College
Arthur McComb, Edinboro State College
Dr. Paul Musgrave, Marshall University
Claude Simons, Tulane, Sugar Bowl
Harry Turpen, Northwestern (La.) State University
E. P. Twombly, Washington & Lee University
George Grimshaw, Tufts University

This concludes the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee, Mr. President.

President Chapman: You have heard the motion to amend the Memorial Resolutions. You have indicated your acceptance by rising.

15. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

President Chapman: You will remember there was a motion to table Item No. 9 until this morning. Actually, the proper statement of that motion is postponed until a definite time, which is now. There is no need to remove that item from the table.

Amateurism—Summer Expenses

Bob McWhorter (Southeastern Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 9 to amend the Constitution, Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(3).

[The motion was seconded.]

I move now to amend the amendment with No. 162.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is one of the recommendations from the Special Committee

on Enforcement to the Council to prevent, as it were, the payment of expenses for such things as golf and tennis during the summer for any student whether regularly involved or not. There seems to have been a great deal of this going on nationwide, and several athletic directors and several others felt that we were putting too much pressure and spending too much money to buy this kind of thing. In addition, it was a recruiting advantage for the wealthier football institutions.

[Proposal No. 162 (page A-80) was approved by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 9 (page A-4) was approved by show of paddles.]

Transfers

Frank Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): In behalf of the Council, I request we reconsider No. 32. In fact, I move we reconsider No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe that we have passed some legislation of which we did not realize the effect. This legislation would allow an individual to participate in football at your institution then attend another university in the spring to get healthy on his grades and come back to your institution and, in effect, get in trouble, and then go to another one and get his grades up. He could do this for four years.

I believe this is legislation we do not desire to have in our program. I ask you to vote against No. 32.

[Motion to reconsider Proposal No. 32 (page A-15) was defeated by Division III by show of paddles and approved by Division I and Division II, each by show of paddles.]

President Chapman: Proposal No. 32 will be reconsidered by Divisions I and II. Anyone want to speak for the proposition?

Mr. Lindeburg: In behalf of the Council, I ask Divisions I and II to vote this proposition out of our legislation.

[In reconsideration, Proposal No. 32 (page A-15) was defeated by Division I and Division II, each by show of paddles.]

Transfers

Walter Hass (University of Chicago): I rise to ask for reconsideration of Item No. 30 for Division III.

[The motion was seconded.]

I merely want to say there are some items in here that I don't think most people really looked at. There are opportunities of young men to compete in one sport in an institution and transfer to another institution and compete in that sport there immediately. I don't believe that is a good idea.

Robert Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): The reason this amendment was posed was primarily for us on Eligibility Committee. We had a number of cases in which an individual will start to school, drop out of school and the five-year period will start. He will work or there will be some other reason why he will be out of school for a period of two, three, even four years. He then will want to return to college and goes to a college closer to his home and decides that he would like to compete there. That is the reason this amendment was put into the program.

[Motion to reconsider Proposal No. 30 (page A-15) in Division III was defeated by voice vote.]

Eligibility Rules

George Ilg (California State University, Fresno): In behalf of the Council, I would like to move this Convention to consider Proposition No. 35 prior to Proposition No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Chapman: It has been moved and seconded that we consider Proposition No. 35 ahead of No. 34. We will change the order, and it will take the two-thirds vote.

[Motion to change order was approved by voice vote.]

Ernest Casale (Temple University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move Proposal No. 163 amending the amendment be approved.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the amendment is to remove any reference to the 2,000 rule for Divisions II and III, except the regulation for junior college transfers and competition which is presently in Bylaw 4-1. So there would be no changes in those two divisions.

Incidentally, in No. 163, you will find (j)-1, the third one down there. There would be one for 2,000 achievers. You might want to write in there editorially that is for all three divisions after the word *competition*. This does not change anything which we do not have now.

[Proposal No. 163 (page A-80) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

I would like to move, so we can have some order here, that the question on No. 35 be divided between A and B.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

We are now discussing Proposal No. 35, Part A. Now A refers to institutional eligibility. By passing A, so we understand it, we will have the effect of giving us in-season eligibility rules. Certainly, this would simplify our legislation. That is one of the first things. In addition, it would eliminate the present condition, as I indicated the other day, whereby a member can qualify for a championship using athletes who could not compete in the championship.

I guess I will have to reiterate that basically there are only two differences, the transfer rule for the four-year colleges and one of the parts of the transfer rule from junior colleges. It is still my opinion and the opinion of others that waivers for transfer rules should be provided for by the provisions in the Bylaws. The example is a hardship case.

Today we have waivers by various conferences and there is a lot of variation. In addition, I would reiterate that the conference which has an automatic qualifier in sports is bound by the rules of Bylaw 4-1 for in-season eligibility of these sports. This is exactly what the proposal provides.

Fred Shabel (University of Pennsylvania): I would like to speak in opposition to 35-A, and I would address myself to all of our members who voted against Nos. 18 and 19. It was clear to most of us when you voted against Nos. 18 and 19 you were indicating a strong desire for institutional and conference autonomy. If you accept 35-A, you are once again losing institutional and conference autonomy. You will have in-season mandates that you don't presently have.

I agree completely with the fact that we should have controls and mandates for championship play. If you will look around the room, very few of us have that opportunity for championship play, so I suggest in the strongest way a no vote for 35-A for the same reasons you voted against Nos. 18 and 19. Do not allow us to go home with mandates for in-season play that we don't presently have.

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): I would like to ask Mr. Casale if he can show me where it says all its intercollegiate programs, if this is what he actually means; or does he mean NCAA championships?

Mr. Casale: No, it means all the sports which you list on the form that you submit to the NCAA or for which there are NCAA championships.

Mr. Morgan: In other words, are you saying my rugby team would come under that?

Mr. Casale: That is intercollegiate?

Mr. Morgan: Yes, it is.

Mr. Casale: In my view, it would come under it, too.

Mr. Morgan: I would vehemently oppose this legislation, because we have something like 18 sports. I believe there are 11 championship sports, and the other seven are conducted partially under our conference rules and regulations. A sport like rugby—graduate students can participate. I certainly would be against such a proposal.

Mr. Casale (Temple University): There is another way of handling that. I would suggest that you not list that sport on the form which you submit to the NCAA office, indicating the sports.

Mr. Morgan: It is a regular part of my intercollegiate program as are the other six sports other than rugby. Thus, I would support the gentleman from the University of Pennsylvania and his remarks.

Mr. Casale: Answering Fred, Nos. 18 and 19 were Constitutional items; and we all had to vote on those as a group. This can be done, of course, by divisions, and probably will be.

[Part A of Proposal No. 35 (page A-16) was defeated by each division by voice vote.]

Basically, Part B recodifies the present Bylaw 4-1. Under (j) we have an outline of really the eligibility rules with the various possibilities, upper classmen, freshmen and transfers. There are no changes in B except possibly in straightening out the loop holes in a junior college transfer for Division I.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): May I ask you about the language in Section (f) where it says that credits earned in extension or summer courses cannot be counted in satisfying the particular requirement.

In the California State University college system, perhaps in some others, some of the institutions have what is known as year-around operations. Technically, it is not a summer session. They presumably are in session the whole year. Would that preclude those sessions in the year-around operation? I wonder about the fairness with institutions that still have self-support summer sessions.

Mr. Casale: Whether this is passed or defeated doesn't matter because it is in Bylaw 4-1 now. If the rule is defeated, we will have to change it another time.

John Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): It seems to me that we really might have an important change in this legislation. I have

a question about it. It says, (3) *For Transfer Student-Athletes: (a) From four-year institutions.* Then No. 2 says, *Eligibility for aid and practice.* Then it goes on to say for 2,000 achievers there shall be restrictions except that the student-athlete must be eligible under the rules of his institution.

Now, that would seem to me that it could be an important change in our present situation. I realize that O.I. 128 would probably still apply, but this seems to be a change in the wording. If you read that, *There shall be no restrictions*, it would seem to me that it would be interpreted if a student decides to transfer from one four-year institution to another, that while he would not be able to participate that first year, he would be immediately eligible to compete and immediately eligible for athletic aid.

Mr. Casale: That is not true.

Mr. Coyle: That is what the language really says.

Mr. Casale: What you have here does not supersede the O.I. which is under recruiting. You are obligated and bound by those recruiting rules.

Mr. Coyle: What is it if it is not that. What if he is not recruited and he decides on his own to transfer from one institution to another?

Mr. Casale: You must contact that institution to get approval before he gets aid.

Mr. Coyle: You have to get approval from the other institution?

Mr. Casale: Absolutely. That is still there. We can't do anything about that.

Mr. Coyle: But that is under the recruiting section and this is under the transfer section of the eligibility.

Mr. Casale: That is the way the Bylaws are usually written.

Mr. Coyle: Why the change in the language this time if there are no restrictions? This is not a recodification of the existing language. The language now in effect does not read that way. This says there shall be no restrictions for transfers as long as they have the 2,000 average, from one institution to another.

Mr. Casale: What you are referring to is editorial in our Constitution and Bylaws, and there are many things that are necessary to be put in there, but I don't think it should.

Mr. Coyle: I think it should be put in there. It could recreate a lot of problems. When you read this and say no restrictions in giving aid, the guy is immediately eligible to transfer or immediately eligible to compete, when he transfers from one institution to another, as long as he says he wasn't recruited. As far as recruitment, he was, and there is a possibility of a lot of it.

Robert Bruce (College of Wooster): I would like a clarification (e), section 1-(c). Yesterday, there were some resounding votes concerning the matter of satisfactory progress. Where will we stand if this particular section in which we are now about to vote doesn't pass? I am referring to where it says he must be registered for a minimum of at least 12 semester hours, etc.

Mr. Casale: There is no change. I keep telling you this. There is no change. If you were to defeat this, it still is in Article 4-1.

Mr. Bruce: How do we rationalize that between O.I. 15, as it now stands, or 14, I forget which it is, and what we voted yesterday?

Mr. Casale: It says he must be registered for 12 hours. It doesn't say how many he passes that semester.

Mr. Bruce: The problem is still those institutions who are engaged in special programs.

President Chapman: They have a problem now with the 12-hour rule.

Mr. Casale: I hope you all understand we are not changing the provisions which are in Bylaw 4-1, except for two cases I have mentioned. It is one case, really. If there is something wrong with Bylaw 4-1, we will have to change it some other way.

[Part B of Proposal No. 35 (page A-17) was approved by Division II by voice vote; Division I by show of paddles, and Division III, 45-42.]

Individual Eligibility

J. B. Searce (South Atlantic Conference): I move the passage of Proposal No. 34, which amends Article 4, Section 1, which has just been passed.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Searce: The intent of this is to apply NCAA individual eligibility rules to all participants who represent institutions in intercollegiate and other outside events, requiring all member institutions to conform to a minimum standard for individual eligibility.

I would like to point out what is happening in some institutions. An institution could have a case where it employed a new basketball coach. He bring in four transfers.

He recognizes very quickly that his basketball season is going to be a loss, but by using the four transfers he can have a winner. He is not interested in championship competition, so he plays an entire year using these transfer students and, as a result, is rated No. 1 most of the time in the AP and UPI polls.

What has happened is his transfers gained eligibility while they were playing. He had a good recruiting year and is now ready to participate and has a good chance of winning the Division II tournament.

I don't think the members of this body want this kind of practice, and the passage of No. 34 will eliminate this.

George Ilg (California State University, Fresno): In behalf of the Council, I wish to oppose No. 34. I would like to ask the gentleman who was proposing this to define for me or for the Convention what he means by *outside competition*?

Mr. Searce: I think that means any competition with anyone outside the institutions.

Mr. Ilg: If it refers to institutions, intercollegiate and otherwise, other outside events, does this mean AAU or NAIA competition?

Mr. Searce: It sure does.

Mr. Ilg: For that reason, I again, in behalf of the Council, oppose the passage of No. 34.

President Chapman: No. 36 has now become moot since 35-A failed, so we will skip that and move to No. 37.

Institutional Eligibility

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): In behalf of the Council I move the adoption of No. 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to move an amendment to the amendment, which is No. 164.

[The motion was seconded.]

This may look like it is not too involved, and in many respects you may think it isn't; but I do want to say this has been a matter that has been of a great deal of concern to the Association in litigation in the courts. I hope you will bear with me so that I may present some background in this respect.

I am going to have to present the background primarily before the adoption of the amendment, but I think on second thought let me call your attention to the amendment to the amendment. Maybe we can get that out of the way, and then let me give you all the background.

As you will note, we have added an *athletic department staff member*, and it defines it more in detail as to who the representative is in the legislation. In addition, in the case of ice hockey, the number has been raised from two to three. With that amendment, if we can have that considered at this time, then I will get into the justification for No. 37.

[Proposal No. 164 (page A-80) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Moving back to the background on this, as I said, many of you know that we have had litigation in this area. A lot of the judges' bases for the injunctions that were granted in this regard, were in regard to aliens because we had something of an arbitrary definition for an alien participating in regard to his age. This, of course, was considered unconstitutional and for that reason that feature of our Constitution or of our Bylaws was considered improper.

Nevertheless, we sense that at least with reference to some sports, the NCAA championships are being distorted or perhaps even destroyed by the excessive reliance placed by some schools on athletes recruited from abroad. This feeling is particularly prevalent, we believe, with respect to those cases where, as a practical matter, established world-class athletes are being brought to this country—not primarily for the purpose of an education or for an enrichment of our student body—but to augment an institution's chances to participate in NCAA championships in a particular sport.

I should emphasize this is applicable to the championships. The Committee and the Council are, therefore, submitting this particular proposition. We emphasize that the recruitment is designed to limit the recruitment abroad of foreign athletes, not as was in the case of the old alien student rule; but the participation of the foreign athletes in championship event. Thus, under the proposed rules, there is no limit on competition or financial assistance for athletes who are already lawfully admitted to the United States when first recruited by a member institution or for the foreign athletes that walk onto the practice field after admission to the institution.

There are no limits on championship competition for athletes who first have been contacted abroad to participate after the first year in residence in competition without benefit of athletic or related financial aid.

For this reason, of course, and others that I can go on, we have made a survey and a study and from this standpoint have established the numbers that could be used in regard to recruiting or our efforts

to recruit in these various fields.

This has been an important matter and has been established, of course, on the recommendation of the various playing sports, and in the case of cross country, one per year. This means, of course, that over a period of time you will have more. Also gymnastics, one; ice hockey, one; skiing, two; soccer, one. Now, ice hockey is three per year, and over a four-year period that would be 12.

I could go on. But, gentlemen, we have a lot of concern in this area, and for this reason the Council is proposing this particular legislation.

Edward Bennett (Washington State University): I have two questions. Is there any reason why tennis was omitted from the list?

President Chapman: The Council talked to various coaches, and they indicated no problem on that.

Mr. Bennett: Might we safely assume those foreign athletes presently under scholarships will not be affected by this?

President Chapman: That is right.

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): I am speaking in behalf of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association. In a special meeting the other evening, we considered the legislation; and I was mandated to express the opposition to it by that Association for two reasons.

First, the problem seems to be easing in ice hockey. The schools which in the past have depended heavily or exclusively on Canadian hockey players are finding more and more they can depend upon the United States hockey players to maintain a high level of competition. Secondly, despite the increase of the number of hockey from two to three, it wasn't really the numbers that brought the opposition, it was the idea of a quota system related to foreign athletes.

In behalf of that Association, I should like to record our opposition to the amendment.

Richard Gibney (Boston University): I would like to also speak in opposition to Proposal No. 37 for a couple of different reasons. I think this proposal will eliminate many schools who have foreign players presently on the team competing in upcoming tournaments. This proposal also will attempt to eliminate these individuals for the next two or three years if they continue to use the foreign players who are presently on their campuses.

There has been a lot of discussions concerning the increase in litigation costs. Our annual report shows that legal expenses last year were in excess of \$380,000. I think if we can exhaust all administrative means of trying to prevent our own individuals from suing the NCAA and suing the institutions, it will be much better. Of course, in the final analysis there is no guarantee they will not do this. I maintain as long as this group continues to put a limit on foreign players that we are buying ourselves more lawsuits.

As such, I ask this group to support us in opposition to this proposal.

William Davis (Idaho State University): I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal. I believe this legislation is discriminatory and establishes an arbitrary quota and it is contrary to institutional policies in terms of access to intercollegiate competition and activity by all students.

Earl Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I would like

to speak in support of this. One of the most important principles we have underlying our Association, I think, is that our athletes should be representative of the student body; and the implication from several of these comments has been that you are against the use of foreign athletes. This is simply not true. The use of deliberated recruitment of foreign athletes simply controverts this principle that helps us to keep our athletic teams truly representative locally and nationally of our several student bodies.

I would very much urge our support of this amendment.

Leo Miles (Howard University): When I first got the Convention outline of this proposed amendment, I was deeply disturbed. After listening to some of the remarks that were made, I am even more deeply concerned. This country of ours, basically, you will recall, was organized by aliens who came to this country. As we heard the President of the United States and other eloquent people from the Council speak about this great country of ours, which has the greatest athletes in the world, and the people who formulated this country, came to this country because they were seeking justice, equality and opportunity. This country of ours is great because we thrive on competition. Competition is what the businessmen do, competition against one another in order for you to be the greatest.

Our institutions, for over 100 years, have been educating foreign students or alien students, as we refer to them. That is for over 100 years. Here we are in the nation's capital where the embassies of all the countries are located. We are about to celebrate the anniversary of our country. We are in the world with all the confusion and crisis where we are talking about creating another problem.

The world is now looking and waiting and watching to see what we are going to do. This has far-reaching implications in other athletic competition fields. It has deep and significant meaning. This is purely discriminatory, no question about it. When NCAA sponsors 23 sports, and you are going to say that five of these sports now cannot recruit alien students. If that is not discrimination, I don't know what it is.

Not only that, you are going to go even further and decide those that you have selected and picked out, some of them can only have one and some can have two, and some can have three. If that is not discriminatory, I don't know what it is.

We have been saying we want to put into effect ways in which to reduce the expenditures of NCAA. One way is to better write our legislation so that we don't have to go to court and file suits. Our president and our lawyers in our school of law advised me this is discriminatory. So I am asking the rest of the members here to join with me and the rest of you to oppose this amendment and let the world know that the members have come to Washington, D.C. that really believe in what the NCAA stands for.

I think we should show the people in the United States we really mean what we say and we should vote this down overwhelmingly.

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): I think I agree in substance with what Leo said in relation to our Nation, but I am in support of this legislation because I think there is a difference between an individual coming here to immigrate and our coaches recruiting some teams exclusively from foreign students. Thus, I would support this legislation.

Leo Coursey (University of Maryland, Eastern Shore): I want to make a point in opposition to a point that was made concerning this resolution. The point was made earlier that this particular resolution would take care of the problem in terms of the alien students not being representative of that particular student body. I dare submit that there are some campuses which at this particular point may not prove to be true. Two campuses have come to mind immediately would be, one, the University of Maryland, Eastern Shore, where we do have a very large contingent of alien students, and Howard University.

I cannot stand here and say that we do not have a representative body of foreign students on these two campuses. To deny these students an opportunity to participate would be, in fact, discriminatory.

I would also like to add my voice to the group that is opposing this particular proposal.

Jack Davis (Oregon State): At the time that this measure was first published, I also was concerned about discriminating against students that were already on our campus. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Maryland, Eastern Shore this is the reason for the amendment. The amendment does not discriminate against students that come to your campus for bonafide academic reasons or students that are already there. It discriminates against the recruiting, the blatant recruiting in large measure of foreign students for your athletic teams. That is the sole purpose of this.

I have 20 Libyan students joining the Department of Nuclear Engineering next year who were recruited by our registrar. Under the amendment here, they would be allowed to participate because they have not been contacted by our athletic interests. I want to point out that is the purpose of the amendment.

Warren Schmaki (Illinois State University): I rise to speak against this particular piece of legislation. Basically, I think those schools that want to have a great soccer team and want to have a good ski team should be permitted like any other institution who has a great football or, whatever it might be, to go where they want to find their particular athletes.

Many schools are dropping football or taking some of the reduced funds that are available for some of the sports like skiing, etc. I understand the University of Vermont dropped football and has a ski team. If they want to continue to have a ski team and get two or three skiers out of Switzerland or Sweden, they should have that opportunity.

I also want to say in regard to the litigation—some of you gentlemen know I transferred from Boston University, and Boston University has been in litigation with the NCAA and the ECAA for over two years on this particular hockey problem—Boston University has spent, I know, over \$80,000 because two students felt the rule that was put in by the NCAA body relative to hockey was not a good rule. They took us to court. This problem is still being solved.

I am not a lawyer, but I dare say in reading this litigation, I agree with Mr. Miles, that the NCAA will be back in court if this is supported by the general body. Therefore, I ask all of you to vote against this.

Grover Murray (Texas Tech): I am speaking in opposition to this amendment. It is a bunch of semantics. All you have to do is not have

the athletic people contact the foreign students, let the admissions officer contact them. I think it allows for circumvention of the rules and regulations. I think it suggests that people can be crooked.

I think it is unfair to a lot of institutions that recruit students academically and not athletically.

Mr. Bennett: I would like to ask a question. First of all, is Jack Davis' interpretation that your registrar is not considered to be a representative of athletic interests correct?

President Chapman: I believe so, yes, unless he did athletic recruiting.

Mr. Bennett: All right. You answered my question.

President Chapman: O.I. 100 implies what you have to be to have athletic recruitment.

Mr. Bennett: Considering my record yesterday, I hate to say anything on this issue, I am afraid it will lose. [Laughter]

I, too, oppose it on certain other grounds, part of which is the nature of the package that is set up. Why three for hockey and one for track and field? I fail to see the rationalization for that. Also how about your alumni coming from countries such as Australia, or someplace else, who like to recruit people for you; and you find that is a representative of your athletic interest and, therefore, somebody they recommend to you is a super student and you can't take him.

James Young (North Carolina Central University): My major interest in opposition to this amendment is concerning track. I don't think that North Carolina Central has gone out to recruit an alien or foreign athlete. The fact we have been successful in our track program recruited the athletes for us. Therefore, I feel that if a person should desire to come to a school with a successful program, that we should not legislate something to hinder that person from attending and participating.

I also feel as the gentleman just stated, that there is something wrong when we have two, three, and one. I notice right here you have hockey, and you have three. Skiing is one, soccer is one, track and field, one. I would like to ask the reason why. I would also like to know, and I heard the answer but I didn't get a clear understanding of it, as to why tennis is not listed.

I know some of the universities here, most of their team is foreign. How about the soccer kicker? I don't think they came from the United States kicking that ball like soccer. They are imports, and they are foreigners. May we have some of these questions answered before we start voting on this issue?

Richard Lyon (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute): First, I am in opposition to this for many reasons, primarily for the arbitrary figures and the arbitrary sports. I would like to point out when we vote on this, it is quite possible that several of the members may feel that one part of it might be in order, if they are thinking in terms of arbitrary figures.

On the other hand, they may not know enough about the other sports to have a feeling for it. By conscience vote, we may be voting against our conscience in that we have to cover all of these in one blanket.

Mr. Thompson: Let me first say that this amendment was brought to the Convention primarily because of demands from you, demands

from many sports groups. There were rather extensive petitions from various committees. It appeared quite extensive. This has been over a several-year period. I am quite interested in the fact that these people that requested such type legislation do not seem to be appearing at this time. These demands came primarily from track, skiing and soccer.

I might further say that all of the coaching associations were polled for their recommendations as to numbers, and the numbers were arrived as the result of the recommendations of those particular groups. It was the opinion of the tennis group it has not moved into the category where tennis championships are yet dominated by foreign groups. For this reason, this legislation is not before you for just a whim on the part of the Council, but because of a demand and because of the cost picture that was put in by many of you.

For this reason, I want to say that it is not just the imagination of the Council.

Robert Sunderland (West Coast Athletic Conference): I think this particular legislation is discriminatory in the smaller schools. I think we ought to see that it is one way that a smaller school can have a good team by this process.

[Proposal No. 37 (page A-23) was defeated by each division by voice vote.]

Individual Eligibility

David Ocorr (University of Rochester): In behalf of the ECAC, I move Proposal No. 38 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent allows the star student the opportunity to be a star athlete in his final semester.

[Proposal No. 38 (page A-23) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Five-Year Rule

John Toner (University of Connecticut): Speaking in behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

This item is an enabling piece of legislation that would take from the Constitution and place in the Bylaws the five-year rule. The intent is to further enable those institutions who perhaps do not consider playing in postseason competition or at least wish a chance to seek relief on the condition to the five-year rule. The rule would not be applicable for in-season eligibility unless implemented by member institutions and their conferences.

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): I have been asked by the Council to express opposition to this amendment. It does several things. It may do some positive things, but it opens the door to a good many other things. Once again, it provides the opportunity to qualify for championships and then does not enable the institution that qualifies for the championship to use those players in the championship. Further than that, there are a good many indications on the basis of several kinds of studies that the longer a student takes to graduate in terms of number of years, the less likely he is to graduate. The five-year rule serves as a very great stimulant to move along toward graduation.

This provides the opportunity for students to be in and out of school for 10 to 15 years.

Mr. Toner: Everything that the gentleman says I agree with. However, after having been on the ECAC Committee on Eligibility for several years and after hearing of individual hardship cases and after writing up cases and sending them to the NCAA Committee on Eligibility, never once has the five-year case been acted upon, except on an automatic turn-down.

There are those cases, especially among schools which do not participate or do not intend to participate in postseason play. If the NCAA Committee on Eligibility would be sympathetic to such cases as they are involved then there would be no need for this appeal.

Robert Raymond (Slippery Rock State College): We happen to be one of the institutions appealing to you to support this recommendation. Citing a specific incident, we have a young man who went to the University of Lacrosse and proceeded to be forced out of this country. Eventually he got to Canada with no money of any type, and now after six years he's back for some reason, not as a recruited athlete. He happens to be a tennis player, a badminton player, of this nature; and he is now at Slippery Rock State College wanting to participate in tennis.

The young man is not a recruited athlete, receives no financial aid other than the normal foreign student might get if he applies to perhaps any of our institutions. He is now being denied the opportunity of participating in intercollegiate athletics. This hardship opportunity, if it is granted by our own Association, would enable him to take part. This is why we are very much in support of this recommendation.

President Chapman: Let me point out that the two parts have to be split because one is a Constitutional provision and the B part is a Bylaw.

[Part A of Proposal No. 39 (page A-24) was defeated by show of paddles.]

Since the Constitutional provision fails, the remainder of No. 39 is out of order. We will move to Item No. 40 at this time. Without trying to limit the discussions, we should be as succinct as possible because we have a long way to go.

Seasons of Competition

Walter Hass (University of Chicago): I move the adoption of Item No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to clarify that this rule applies to all intercollegiate competition rather than to varsity only.

[Proposal No. 40 (page A-24) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Seasons of Competition

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): I move passage of Proposal No. 41, which would amend Bylaw Article 4, Section 1-(f).

[The motion was seconded.]

In behalf of the Pacific Coast Athletic Association, I would like to say this would permit four years of intercollegiate competition after the freshman year, providing the student-athlete did not compete during his freshman year.

I know we are going to hear about red shirts. That is not any intention about that. It is my feeling that if the young man goes to the college and the first year he doesn't wish to compete, he should have five years in which to get four years of competition.

We want to speak about red shirting. What is the difference in red shirting the first year, the third year or the fourth year? We have, as a matter of principle, approved red shirting with the five-year rule. I see no difference at all to a boy 18 years of age red shirting, or 19 years of age, 20 or 21. I hope you will support this.

George Peterson (California State University, Hayward): I support Mr. Hill on the basis, once again, we are talking about discriminatory practices. We are discriminating against the freshman if he becomes injured. Even if he is a straight A student when he comes in the college and he is injured in his freshman year, he gets only three years of competition. If he is injured in his sophomore year, it doesn't count. If he is injured in his junior year, it doesn't count. I would support his amendment at this time.

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): In the absence of Bill Orwig, a member of the Council, I am rising to speak to oppose this in behalf of the NCAA Council. If the gentleman who just spoke will notice, there is a hardship provision for freshmen that can be voted upon, No. 42. His objection would be met by the passage of that.

One of the problems with going to four years in a five-year period is financial. I think that it is fairly obvious that the pressure is most likely to come increasing the numbers and limitations because every freshman who does not play becomes eligible for that fifth year. This may serve to discourage those who could graduate and get on about the work in the world. It puts athletics as the primary reason for being in school. In behalf of the Council, I would urge that this particular provision be defeated.

[Proposal No. 41 (page A-25) was defeated by Division I, 24-139, and Division III, 21-30. It was approved by Division II, 42-37.]

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): I move to rescind under the provisions of Article 9, Section 1-(e) of the NCAA Constitution with respect to the vote by Division II.

[The motion was seconded.]

In view of the time involved, I will not argue this at great length, but it seems to me it is rather obvious that the transfer of the possibilities here would be certainly exasperating by virtue of having Division II taking a position different than the majority in Divisions I and III.

[Motion to rescind Division II approval of Proposal No. 41 was approved, 290-67.]

Hardship

Walter Hass (University of Chicago): I move the adoption of No. 42, amending O.I. 400, following Bylaw 4-1(f)-(1).

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 42 (page A-25) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 43 (page A-25) was withdrawn.]

Hardship

John Pont (Northwestern University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

We are going to have a reduction in the total number of players available to 105. I think this does give us some latitude.

[Proposal No. 44 (page A-26) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

President Chapman: At this point, we must now consider Item No. 145. It is not an amendment to the amendment, but it is a request by a member for an appeal of an O.I. which is in this same category. It is an appeal on O.I. 400, Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Hardship

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): In behalf of the Pacific Coast Athletic Association, I would like to move that Proposal No. 145 be approved.

[The motion was seconded.]

It seems every time that junior colleges and community colleges get on the floor of the Convention, there seems to be a feeling all of them are located in the West, which absolutely is not the case.

In the 1974-75 National Directory of College Athletics, there are 792 junior colleges and community colleges listed. Out of the 792, 280 of them are west of the Mississippi; 512 are east of the Mississippi River.

In 19 states in the West, including Hawaii and Alaska, there is a total of 280—an average of 14.74 junior colleges west of the Mississippi River for each state. In the states east of the Mississippi River, there are 31 states with 512 community colleges—an average of 16.52 junior colleges in the states east of the Mississippi River.

In the state of California, the junior college program is an integral part of the college education situation. California started first and has more, 98 community colleges. I combined them. Here in the state of Maryland, in 1957, there were three community colleges. Seventeen years later, there are 20 community colleges in the state of Maryland. I would say the junior college movement in this country, the growth and development, is all across the country and not just in the West.

The hardship provision would not apply to a student-athlete who met the provisions if the hardship provisions were a junior college. We are proposing that that be done because of the following reasons: I will hurry through them. Bylaw 4-1-(f)-(1) does not indicate or anticipate it must be a four-year intercollegiate institution.

O.I. 400 does not indicate that the incapacitating condition resulting from the injury or illness must occur at the four-year institution. It does indicate that the injury or illness must occur during the institution's regular schedule for the sport concerned.

The proposal that just passed provides for an illness which occurs in one of the three seasons of varsity competition after the freshman year. Again, there is no indication in that proposal that the four season competition must be by a four-year intercollegiate institution.

O.I. 400 was adopted by the 67th annual NCAA Convention and became effective in August, 1973. There can be reasonable doubt as to the exact intent of this interpretation when it was passed. There is no indication it was intended to apply only to a four-year institution.

If the student-athlete, while attending a junior college satisfies

the requirement of hardship as defined by O.I. 400 and is not granted an additional year of eligibility to member institutions, there are those who would consider it unfair as well as unjust and discriminatory as far as the student-athlete is concerned.

A sophomore in a four-year institution can qualify for additional eligibility while the sophomore in the junior college would not be permitted to do so while enrolled at a four-year institution. In our conference we have a hardship waiver, which requires, first, the student-athlete submit certain information to the athletic representatives to the Council and to the commissioner at least 10 days prior to the Council meeting. It is: (1) the institution is more concerned for the year in question; (2) certification by the athletic representative of the hardship petition, if granted, will not exceed the five-year rule; (3) certification by a doctor as to the date and nature of the injury or illness; and (4) certification by the director of athletics as to the date and the extent of competition in games or contests in which the student-athlete participated.

Harry Troxell (Colorado State University): I would like to speak in behalf of the Council in opposition to this motion. In deference to what he has said here, I think this would open up a problem that would be very difficult to handle. I urge the Convention to turn this down.

[Proposal No. 145 (page A-72) was defeated by Division II, 33-56, and Division I by show of paddles. It was approved by Division III, 41-38. NCAA Officers subsequently ruled this was not a permissible action in that an interpretation must apply equally to all divisions if the Bylaw it interprets applies to all divisions.]

Institutional Eligibility

Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): In behalf of the Council I move for the adoption of Proposition No. 45, which is to amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(2) of the Bylaws.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this is simply to clarify *applicable institutional and conference eligibility rules* by stating that such rules must specifically relate to eligibility for financial aid, practice and/or participation.

[Proposal No. 45 (page A-26) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Obligations of Membership

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): In behalf of the Council I want to talk in terms of both Nos. 46 and 47, even though I will only move No. 46. I will do it at this time. I move the adoption of No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

Yesterday, President Horn of Long Beach State, representing not only his institution but, I think, a number of our presidents, made an eloquent presentation. It was of interest to me that many of our presidents are interested in pursuing a program that is stronger in many respects insofar as enforcement. Nos. 46 and 47 are the results of trying to evolve a plan which will enable a stronger enforcement program. It will put more strength in the hands of our institutions, give them more strength to do things.

These proposals call for a statement. That statement would be administered, of course, by the institution. No. 46 establishes an obligation of the institution to administer that statement to the student-athlete and from this standpoint is an implementing legislation. It establishes that as an obligation.

I want to be sure that you understand what that statement is. According to No. 47, the form that will be evolved on the NCAA Council and is a statement related to that student-athlete's eligibility, his recruitment, his financial aid and amateur status under the governing legislation of this Association.

[Proposal No. 46 (page A-26) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Eligibility

Mr. Thompson: In behalf of Council, I should like to move for the adoption of No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 47 (page A-27) was approved by show of paddles.]

Obligations of Membership

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): In behalf of the Council, I move for the adoption of No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

This was discussed in the Round Table. I don't know if there is much more to discuss about it. The intent is to affirm that the Association's legislation, and, therefore, the members' obligation to abide by that legislation pertains only to those sports recognized as intercollegiate sports.

William Dioguardi (Montclair State College): In behalf of the New Jersey State College Athletic Conference and Montclair State College, I have to say we are in agreement with the principles and the permissiveness of this legislation; but we are concerned about the timing and possibly some may want to table this until another time is better.

Warren Schmakel (Illinois State University): I move Proposal No. 48 be tabled at this time.

[The motion was seconded.]

I read in the papers this morning that many of the athletic directors got calls from the women at their colleges. I am from Illinois State; and I had a call from the president of our school, who was concerned about it.

[Proposal No. 48 (page A-27) was tabled by voice vote.]

Allied Members' Voting Privileges

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): In behalf of the NCAA Council and the Special Committee on Reorganization, I move the adoption of Proposition No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 49 (page A-28) was approved by show of paddles.]

Athletic Consortiums

Walter Hass (University of Chicago): I move Proposal No. 50 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 50 (page A-28) was approved by voice vote.]

Dues of Members

Jack Sawyer (Wake Forest University): At the request of the Council and the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

This was explained fully in the Round Table discussion. This concerns the change in the dues structure. The increased funds, along with the increase from television, will enlarge the enforcement program to the extent of giving more in-depth enforcement and more rapidly in which the cases can be handled in the national office.

Willis Casey (North Carolina State University): I would like to speak in opposition to this. I am in favor of expanding the program, but I think it is the wrong way to raise the money. I would suggest that we assess the football television program the necessary percentage to finance an adequate enforcement program. My reasons for this is that the majority of the numbers, the smaller schools, are hurt by all TV programs and they get little financial return out of it. This would be an opportunity to help.

Charles Samson (Texas A&M University): I wish to speak in favor of this proposed amendment. As with many proposals that come before this body, we must pay the cost of that investment of the resources against the expected benefits to be derived. With respect to cost, it seems to me while the percentage of increase may be significantly more for some schools because of their enrollment, the actual amount of the dues increase proposed is still of a relatively modest amount in comparison to the school's whole budget.

It seems to me the purpose for which this increased revenue will be spent is effective enforcement of the rules, is important in the future of NCAA and would do much to enhance our image. It also is my understanding that part of the TV revenue is intended to be expended for this purpose. I urge favorable consideration of this amendment.

J. O. Coppedge (U.S. Naval Academy): Speaking in behalf of the Television Committee, the Television Committee has voted to modify the present Plan to increase the assessment one-half of one per cent to go in the enforcement. This vote was taken with the understanding that the dues would be increased as shown in the Manual.

[Proposal No. 51 (page A-28) was approved by each division by show of paddles.]

Resolution: Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

James Daniels (Valdosta State College): Because a number of delegates will have to leave by mid-afternoon to catch flights, we think it would be in order to consider moving to Proposal No. 168 concerning women's intercollegiate athletics to the first item on the agenda after the luncheon recess. I think the importance of this is known to all of us as we go back to our institutions. I move that Proposal No. 168 concerning women's intercollegiate athletics be placed on the agenda to be discussed immediately after the luncheon break.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Basketball Contests

Peter Carlesimo (Fordham University): I would like to make the same recommendation regarding Proposal No. 122, regarding 27 bas-

ketball games. I move to place that on the agenda immediately following the luncheon recess.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Institutional Eligibility

Stephen Goodspeed (University of California, Santa Barbara): As one of those who actively sponsored Proposition No. 66, as amended by No. 148, I move to have that item taken up at this moment because it has a significant bearing on the entire proceedings of the Convention. I would urge that we have ample time to discuss this particularly while everyone is present.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

I now move to amend Item No. 66 with No. 148.

[The motion was seconded.]

There were 50 presidents, vice-presidents and special representatives of the presidents in attendance at our various meetings to try and hammer out a workable procedure to bring the concept of individual responsibility into NCAA member institution relationships. In our enforcement program, there would be an option or a correlated development of not simply institutional responsibility, not simply student-athlete responsibility, but also individual professional responsibility.

All of you gentlemen are here just as I think the presidents are here, because you have the highest respect for the profession and the integrity and you are trying to preserve it in the coaching staff and the entire athletic staff. That is why you devote thousands of hours in doing this and deal with this very complicated problem.

May I say the presidents are quite aware that this provision should not be limited simply to the coaching staff, but the parliamentary situation prevented us from broadening what was now in the original No. 66, to include all athletic staff.

We would hope if this is adopted to change that at the next Convention. We think that the time is now to make some progress in this direction. Now, let me explain this proposal. We have the cooperation of the executive director, Mr. Byers. Neils Thompson of the Council worked with us in the early stages, and we had the legal counsel of the NCAA assist us.

I realize the language might seem a little complicated, and I will try to put this in as simple English language as I can. What this does is tie in the existing Section 7-(a)-(12), which is a show-cause section of the enforcement procedure, in which the NCAA, given a series of institutional infractions, can ask the institution to show cause why they have not taken a particular disciplinary action against members of the coaching staff who have committed flagrant violations or any violation.

The intent of this is to get at the repeated pattern and practice of a member of the coaching staff, not the coach that inadvertently bought a student a \$10 pair of shoes because he wanted him to look good on a trip. You all know what we are talking about. You have been through enough of these cases. This would tie that in with the section that we originally noted in No. 66, referred to as 3-6-(a)

in the Constitution dealing with the principle of ethical conduct.

I think all of us who see coaching as an honorable profession realize it is not simply do you obey the particular law, it is the spirit of the law. When we go out to an awards banquet and preach the virtues of team work and competitive aspects, it is important that we are talking about these ethical considerations.

Young men and women in this country look to you and look to us for this type of leadership. I can't think of any more fundamental principle the NCAA is directly concerned about. We didn't want to do something willy-nilly, and we are quite aware that some time down the line there could be pending court action. That is what the NCAA legal counsel was quite aware of. Therefore, we had to draw what seemed to be perhaps, if you merely look at the legal language, a somewhat complicated proposal.

What this does in essence, is this: If an institution is found by the Committee on Infractions, the Council and/or the Convention to have been in violation of the NCAA rules and regulations, that institution could not only take what action it felt was necessary in its own terms against the members of the coaching staff involved, which might include dismissal or resignation or withdrawing the coaching for the time served or whatever; but this provision, if adopted, would permit that institution, provided they did not disbar the coach for more than two years, to do that.

That doesn't mean they can't disbar them in their own institution forever, or fire them—that is their business. Now, I suspect everybody in the room is saying, "Oh, my gosh, how many of us are affected?" I asked Warren Brown, the assistant executive director, how many coaches had been named in the last five years, which is what the enforcement program generally covers, the period of eligibility, as violators of the principles of ethical conduct? Warren's answer was less than 20, he thought.

There are over 700 member institutions in this very fine organization. There are thousands of coaches in America and in the last five years we have had a staff of less than 20 for the enforcement program. Let's say the spirit of this amendment isn't to punish past transgressions so much as to get the principle established and spread throughout the honorable coaching profession in this country, to give a few signals of ethical conduct to the assistant coaches on recruiting trips and everything else.

[Proposal No. 148 (page A-73) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 66 (page A-36) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. If I now move to reconsider and then move to table that motion, this could not be reconsidered later in the day when hundreds of the delegates have left the Convention? If this is done, then a few people could not take action at 7 p.m. and reverse our action? Am I correct in my interpretation?

Parliamentarian Harry Cross: Yes.

Mr. Horn: In that case I move to reconsider the action on No. 66, and then lay that on the table.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Penalty Structure

Cliff Speegle (Southwest Athletic Conference): In light of the passage of No. 66, I move we consider Item No. 72 as the next item on the agenda.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Mr. Horn: I know this will come out, but you will note this has several sections in it. What we were trying to do here was to get again the concept of the enforcement procedure that there are not only institutional penalties, and with a wide-range of people you also have individual penalties.

We also used some of the language that the University of Kansas has proposed in Item No. 74, and this is any penalty shall be appropriate. I believe it used the word *commensurate* with the severity of the violation.

The Committee shall avoid institutional penalties which impose mass penalties on all athletes in a specific sport or on all athletes in every sport sponsored by the penalized institution. This whole attempt here is to get the punishment to fit the crime and not to band unreasonably innocent athletes that might be a sophomore or junior in high school now and never had a thing to do with the violation.

If they get a student-athlete on the staff that has committed these violations, what this does is to try to get some order here and a recognition that there are individual penalties as well as institutional penalties, and open up this range.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I would like to ask President Horn about paragraphs (1) through (10) and see if I am right on this. If the institution was not found to be in violation, that if the coach or just the student was found to be in violation, the institution could return the revenue from games that were forfeited or otherwise also back to the conference or to the NCAA; and therefore, that was the final and only judgment against the institution?

Mr. Horn: That subject does come up in other proposals we have offered. I am not quite sure on the impact here. Our thought is there is no attempt to reduce by this language the levy of institutional penalties. We all know that it could be in some situations that the administration, the board of trustees and everybody else is in cahoots with having an improper, unethical athletic program. All this is to do is to preclude board penalties that affect all athletes in the extent of denying them the right to participate.

What we are trying to get at in this and others is that you don't put us in double jeopardy when the net receipts have already been transferred to the conference. We are talking about the conference taking that money and then dividing it up, and then have to send it back to you through the back door.

What we are talking about is the effect on this, and the several amendments that will face up to that one, where you have given the postseason receipts to your conference, and then later some infraction is found to have been committed, and still later the NCAA requests the return of those net receipts. If you have been required for your participation in that conference to transfer those receipts, that you would not have to pay those back to the NCAA.

The reason is if such a sequence of events occur in which we get into the position where we have to start suing our conferences to

reclaim the money we are told we illegally possessed and might have possessed and spent it three years before, it is beside the fact, and we then are in a very difficult position. We feel we shouldn't have to go to the conference to do it.

Mr. Broyles: Wait just a minute. Dr. Chapman, if the institution itself was not found guilty of any misuse by the coach and the student-athlete, is this amendment going to say that all the institution has to do is then repay any of the money that they have received unrightfully back to the conference and they are, therefore, not to be put on probation or whatever the words you want to say? That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. Horn: No, the institution could still be put on probation. The net receipts, if they had played ineligible players and that was confirmed all the way up, certainly can be requested by the NCAA to be returned. We are not saying the institution will have to return them. All we are saying is that a portion of those net receipts that have already gone to the conference in good faith under the rules of this conference would not be returned.

Mr. Broyles: I am not through, but I will quit because of the time. What you are saying is the game receipts the institution has returned were not theirs to return. They have earned it unrightfully, so they have not been punished. They have not done anything.

I am asking, and I just happen to believe in this saying that the school doesn't have the responsibility, that the buck stops with the coach and the athlete, and I want to speak against that. I don't think the buck should stop with the coach and the athlete.

Mr. Horn: Let me say I don't think the buck should stop with the coach and the athlete, either. The point is that all the institution's natural money or all those net receipts which the institution received and kept, even though it spent every dime three years before, it still would owe back to the NCAA; but what would automatically go to the conference, that here they are going to maintain good standing with the conference. In other words, what we don't want to have to do is to pay it back twice. We don't mind paying it once. We have paid it to the conference, we have paid it back to the NCAA, but we don't want to be billed for \$64,000 and end up paying roughly \$90,000, because we have to repay the conference share.

Mr. Broyles: I agree with that, Dr. Horn. What I am asking, after you had paid it back, now, then, is there any recourse to the institution to go on probation and penalize the other students which you mentioned there? Does this particular amendment eliminate that? That is what I am asking.

Mr. Horn: I think you are talking about the first portion and maybe you would want to divide the question on that. The University of Kansas has the same concern in No. 74.

I am told they have tried to be more discerning and say that the violations are in football and not by the school on probation. Perhaps the Committee on Infractions also can speak on that point. But we are trying to limit the penalty that those people that have been the transgressors; that is the spirit behind that language.

Mr. Broyles: I agree with that wholeheartedly, but I do have some reasons for thinking the institution should still be liable and judged even though they had nothing to do with the coach or the athlete, or

wasn't proven. I have my reasons, and when it comes time to speak on that I would like for someone else to give me the clarification. I will still speak against it.

Jack Sawyer (Wake Forest University): Speaking for the members of the Infractions Committee, we are very much against the statement that makes so-called mass penalties on our members. For example, it would be possible for a school to have its first 22 football players in violation. This would say we could not put its football team on probation. It would keep unscrupulous coaches from going out and paying \$1,000 a month to buy five top-flight players, hoping that no more than two of them get caught. He can still continue his season with the other three.

If we were unable to place specific sports, complete teams on probation, we would lose our effective tool of enforcement.

Mr. Horn: I move the proposal be divided, so the issues can be dealt with separately. I believe there are two basic points there and it is not improper to ask for that.

Let's divide so the bold face type dealing with the avoiding of mass penalties would be considered as one action, and the reorganization and the penalties to recognize there are such things as individual penalties and institutional penalties would be considered as the next question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

William L. Matthews (University of Kentucky): I need a clarification as to exactly where the division occurs. I want to speak to that matter.

President Chapman: At the bottom of the first paragraph.

Mr. Matthews: And Item (b)?

Mr. Horn: Where it says, *shall be carefully protected in all instances*. It stops after that.

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): I am afraid I am confused in light of President Horn's recent comments concerning the proposition now before this body and the language contained in No. 148 and No. 66 which were just adopted.

President Horn has stated that the thrust of the University of Kansas amendment and his amendment is to eliminate broad penalties. Yet, if you look at No. 148 in Proposal No. 66, if a coach in a sport is under this period of debarment, the institution cannot enter an NCAA sponsored meet or tournament. This would seem to affect the entire sports program of the institution. Perhaps I misunderstand it.

Mr. Horn: You are right, we are putting higher standards on professionals in the profession than we are on innocent student-athletes. We are expecting the profession to put its own house in order, not the student members of the track team to put the basketball team in order.

Mr. Neinas: If you have a football coach who is undergoing his period of debarment, does that mean the track team cannot enter in an NCAA championship?

Mr. Horn: Yes, if he is in that period and he is still coaching football. Let me make one thing clear here. It is only the annual certification that this applies to. This annual certification by the chief executive, which is the language we amended, occurs in August. Should

an infraction be discovered, the hearing held, the six-month, one-month, up to two-year debarment occurs, that coach, even though he violated the principles of the ethical conduct, could coach that whole year.

President Chapman: We don't seem to be discussing that.

Mr. Horn: He has asked that question in relation to it. He could coach until the next annual certification, coach the full year. It is not a disbarment at that time, at that point. It is when the certification occurs.

When this occurs, you are correct if you insisted on playing with a disbarred coach, you could conduct all your non-NCAA-sponsored meets and games; but you cannot get into NCAA-sponsored meets and tournaments. This depends on how good your teams are, if you want to risk that, keeping the coach.

Otherwise, you can make him president of the university, director of athletics, whatever, just don't have him coaching for that two-year period.

Mr. Neinas: I would say in light of Proposal No. 66, that the philosophy which is being espoused contrary to what is actually taking place.

Mr. Speegle: I move we table the first half of Proposal No. 72 at this time.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

In the light of the confusion on the second half of Proposal No. 72, I move that we table this half.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[First paragraph of Proposal No. 72 (page A-39) was tabled by show of paddles, remainder by voice vote.]

Transfer of Membership

Douglas Weaver (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I move adoption of Proposal No. 52. The intent is clear.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 52 (page A-29) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Change of Division

George Ilg (California State University, Fresno): In behalf of the Council, I move we adopt Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move to adopt Proposition No. 146 which amends No. 53, by inserting by a two-thirds vote of its members present and voting.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 146 (page A-73) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 53 (page A-29) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Change of Division

Mr. Ilg: In behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move to amend Proposal No. 54, by moving the adoption of No. 147.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 147 (page A-73) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 54 (page A-30) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 55 (page A-30) was withdrawn.]

Membership Divisions

Ernest Maglisco (California State University, Chico): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is designed to allow one team of a Division III school to compete in Division II. I would like to point out that the Reorganization Committee recognized the need for a team to move from one division to another, when they allowed the move to Division I. I think the need is greater to move to Division II. A move from Division III to Division I is quite large. I think more Division III schools might have one sport on their campus that might fit in Division II classification.

We are such a campus. We have a swimming team that was the College Division championship; and if they compete in the Division III championship this year, it will be a very one-sided affair. I am sure that the coaches and athletes will return from that championship dissatisfied.

I was surprised that some people felt this amendment would weaken the new organizational structure. I feel that it will strengthen this structure. It should provide more equitable competition in Divisions III and II. We have already seen that very few schools exercise their option to place a sport into Division I.

I think the effect of this amendment will be that a few Division III schools which have a sport in a non-revenue category in which it feels it could compete better in Division II, it will remove that sport from the Division III championship. This championship will become more equitable in Division II, so there will be more—that will become more representative of the level of talent in that division across the country.

President Chapman: I might point out to the membership since this is a Bylaw 10, would have the so-called integrated bylaws, it will have to pass each of the three divisions in order to be binding on any of them. I wish the record would show that was true with Nos. 53 and 54. Those proposals were passed by each of the three Divisions.

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal in behalf of the Council. I will be as brief as I can in this. As you will recall, in the reorganization it was emphasized that paramount among these goals was the establishment of compatibility at all levels within the umbrella of one Constitution.

In the interest of this meaningful compatibility, there was a strong sentiment to hold to a plan whereby each institution would commit itself to Division I, II or III across the board. It was felt this was the best way to assure broad programs at each level. This was not a 100 per cent cause, however. The method of determining football classification was by the then active Statistics and Classification Committee.

Very briefly, in the compromise, without going all through it, we

did permit a school to self-determine basketball which was very critical; but if you did determine Division I in basketball, you had to be Division I all the way across, again, to discourage individual institutions from emphasizing one sport at the disadvantage perhaps of the other.

The Council feels if we accept this we will be getting an erosion that could lead to an up and down across the board. You could have student-athletes in one school trying to meet eligibility rules in three divisions.

In Division II, you could be competing against students with much higher, that is sought out under higher recruiting levels. There could be confusion of two or three types of schools in one conference. We urge that you give the championship plan a chance to go through a few more years under its present organization.

[Proposal No. 56 (page A-30) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposals Nos. 57, 58 and 59 (page A-31 and A-32) were withdrawn.]

Division III Criteria

Mr. Smith: I move that Proposal No. 60 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

Division No. III discussed it at its Round Table, and it doesn't need much discussion. The intent is to establish a minimum academic performance requirement for an incoming student to qualify for a permissible Academic Honor Award.

[Proposal No. 60 (page A-32) was approved by Division III by show of paddles.]

Division III Criteria

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I move No. 61 be approved.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 61 simply permits tuition remission, assistance or similar remuneration to members of the faculty and staff at our respective institutions, which is normally a part of the fringe benefit of a teaching opportunity and would, in this case, provide that need could be exceeded if, indeed, it was this kind of grant.

[Proposal No. 61 (page A-33) was approved by Division III by voice vote.]

Obligations of Membership—Legal Costs

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I move the adoption of Item No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

On this item, the intent requires the members of this Association to exhaust the internal remedies which are available before they begin a lawsuit or directly or indirectly encourage another to bring a lawsuit before the remedies have been exhausted. It would require them to cooperate with the Association.

Action could be taken against them if they failed to do this. They could be required to pay a part of the legal fees which this Association incurs because of their failure to exhaust the internal remedies before they started some of the lawsuits.

Warren Schmakel (Illinois State University): Who is to determine whether the institution has exhausted all of the various avenues with the NCAA? Would this be the Council?

Mr. Swank: Yes.

Mr. Schmakel: Being a state institution like Illinois State University, and there are many other institutions here like that, you should realize if you vote for this particular legislation, you may be voting for monies you don't legally have or were not appropriated by your state legislatures to spend.

I know that Illinois State and some of the state schools in the East I have talked to feel that they are running into considerable problems with this particular item. The thing I think you must realize is that some of the legislation has been passed here in previous years, such as O.I. 5 and O.I. 6, for example, which related to Canadian hockey players, after yesterday has been deleted because it was bad legislation.

What I am driving at here is we should completely study some of the legislation so we don't again get ourselves into court actions such as O.I. 5 and O.I. 6. You gentlemen from the state institutions better be sure that you have the concurrence of your president and perhaps your state boards of trustees when you start paying legal fees that the NCAA might ask you to pay at a later date because of a suit brought by some student against legislation which you have enacted.

Mr. Swank: I am afraid you misunderstand the amendment, because what this does is it precludes the institution from bringing the lawsuit or precluding the institution from directly or indirectly from going out and encouraging its alumni to bring a lawsuit. This is what it prevents. If some student goes out on his own and brings a lawsuit, this particular provision would not apply.

Mr. Schmakel: Well, who again determines whether the alumni got the lawsuit? That is, how did the action come up on the Boston University hockey team?

Mr. Swank: This will be done by the Council and the Infractions Committee.

Mr. Schmakel: Not by any court decision?

Mr. Swank: No, sir. I suppose that could end up in court, a court deciding. But the initial decision would be made by the Infractions Committee and the Council.

Mr. Schmakel: This may be repetitious, but I am not sure I understand the scope of this. Am I to understand that the Council determines whether the institution has cooperated fully or not, directly or indirectly induced suit and determines how much of the legal expense the institution may incur; and all of those judgments are made solely by the NCAA Council? Is that correct?

President Chapman: Just as any other infraction case, yes.

Mr. Schmakel: I think the onesidedness of this provision and the next amendment is clear, and I oppose this one and the next one also.

John Mahlstedt (University of Iowa): A point of inquiry. Just so that it will be a matter of record, does exhausting all appeal procedures include the final appeal to a Convention; or is it assumed that action by the Council will include the formal appeal procedures? I would like an answer to that just so it is in the record.

President Chapman: Final appeal of the Council is the ultimate one.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I worry a little bit about this. In looking at our own situation, I have made a conscientious determination not to pursue legal actions against the

NCAA and to use the internal processes; but I am concerned about public institutions where we have either a system general counsel or our own and have state laws that say we cannot use state funds to do certain things. I am concerned that an institution is being prevented from going into court and asserting what it sincerely believes are its legal rights.

I think I share the NCAA's concerns about the so-called alumni judge where you can go in and get a little friendly injunction. Not having a school of law, I don't face that happy prospect. But I do think we have a real worry here on this one and the next one, and especially on the time in which you would act on these appeal procedures.

Douglas Weaver (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I also oppose this legislation. I believe it is too vague in such an important area. I believe also that the intent passage of the paragraph is a little misleading. I am against it.

Richard Gibney (Boston University): I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal, particularly regarding the Council's power to question whether or not the institution followed through in exhausting all means of appeals. In the situation of Boston University the last couple of years, in the case of Bucton and Marzo, Boston declared them ineligible to compete in ice hockey. They later not only sued NCAA but Boston University.

I agree with these other gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to this proposal. I don't think we can control these people from suing. Frankly, if they feel they are being discriminated against, particularly if you are representing a state institution—unless you have talked to the Board of Trustees with the legislators in regard to this—I don't think we can be a part of this.

[Proposal No. 62 (page A-33) was defeated by show of paddles.]

[The Convention recessed at noon]

BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Afternoon, January 8, 1975

The session convened at 1:30 p.m., President Alan Chapman presiding.

President Chapman: We will come back to order.

16. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Resolution: Women's Intercollegiate Athletics

Mr. David Swank (Oklahoma University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 168.

[The motion was seconded.]

In discussing the resolution, I will be brief. I think the resolution points out that the Council does occasionally hear the words of the membership that there was a slight problem with our plan for implementation of those sports. This resolution seeks to reach and provide an answer to some of the complaints which we have heard in the hallways and in this meeting room.

This directs the Council to prepare a report and plan on the various items involving women's intercollegiate athletics, circulate this to the membership and develop a further plan for 1976.

It also directs the Committee on Women's Sports to try and determine if it is desirable to conduct any pilot programs in women's national championships. None of these will be held during this academic year. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Charles Samson (Texas A&M University): As a matter of information, while I am generally in favor of this resolution, I am curious if there is any plan to get input from the women's organizations. Is there any way of getting any enlightenment on this from the AIAW, or any others while this study is being made?

Mr. Swank: I am sure during the next year there will be some discussion with the AIAW. I don't know how you can go very far without having some discussion with the AIAW, to be very frank about it. I think it is inappropriate to direct it in this particular piece of legislation.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): I have been most interested in this area, and I was quite concerned about the initial steps that were taken and helped propose a resolution that would have been slightly different. I must say this resolution, from my standpoint, encompasses all the safeguards that most of us were looking for.

From this standpoint, I feel as a member of the Council, I will continue to try to be sure we make all the contacts with the AIAW and pursue a program that will be balanced in this respect. From this standpoint, I personally would like to support the Resolution.

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): The preceding remarks reflect my own feeling exactly. I am very supportive of this resolution and would like to express thanks to the Council for its reconsideration of this matter in the resolution that is now drafted.

John Larsen (University of Southern California): In view of the fact that this whole topic of the Association's relationships with the subject of women's intercollegiate athletics has been a complete surprise to the members of the Convention, I propose that the Resolution be tabled until the next Convention.

President Chapman: I wish you wouldn't do that. This is a very important thing and it needs to be discussed.

Mr. Larsen: I do move to table it.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Al Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I don't want simply to table it but also to have a thorough discussion before hand. I want to have my cake and eat it, too. In any event, I think this resolution does some of the harm that was done by the surprise announcement; but there is a lot more harm than this proposal will repair.

The Council takes position that they can propose a pilot program without consulting anyone and without anyone's approval or assent.

As I read this resolution, that still is their position. I see no safeguards in the resolution against the Council's instituting pilot programs or other programs between now and the next Convention without our prior knowledge or consent. Furthermore, although Dave Swank says he doesn't see how the program can be developed without consulting with women's organizations, the pilot program he presented Monday was developed without any consultation with the women, as he himself admitted from the rostrum during the Round Table.

Now, I would like to know what assurances there are that the Council will recognize they do not have the power to experiment in this area without the Convention's and the member's approval of these programs beforehand. I would like to know what assurances there are when this academic year ends in the spring that we may be faced with a pilot program in the fall. There are rumors here that such are being planned right now before the next Convention.

Mr. Swank: I can't assure you that it will not be done. However, if you will realize this directs a circulation of the membership and if the membership were strongly against any such pilot programs when the Council gets the information back, I doubt seriously it will act to start any such pilot programs.

I think, however, and I will be very frank, I would hope this Association would not prevent the Council from experimenting in certain areas. Now, as I said, I don't think they intend to go ahead with anything if the membership says don't do it. That will be up to the next Council to decide what to do.

I think the resolution actually speaks to the point, gives the members an opportunity to respond to the information which the Council has sent out. Remember, the Council is your elected representatives. I think they are going to generally follow what the membership wants.

President Chapman: The Chair would like to try and maintain neutrality on any issue. I would like to say a word in behalf of the Council. They are not 18 evil men sitting in darkened rooms concocting ideas on any proposition. Sometimes we goof, this is true; but the Council is made up of guys just like everyone else in the room. It happens to be 18 who are devoting a lot of time. I don't

think any of them are going to run off and do something contrary to the wishes of the Convention.

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): I appreciate your remarks about the Council and I, too, believe as you do. But I think in this particular instance the Council, in their own wisdom, misdirected their efforts. I think when you in this day and age, in the climate we have right now in women's intercollegiate athletics, think we as a body, either our representatives or ourselves, try to determine what is best for the women, we are totally on the wrong track.

I do not see in this resolution the fact that we are going to seek out from the women what direction they want, if any, from the NCAA. If that were specifically stated in this, then, I would be for the resolution. It is not specifically stated; and therefore, I will be against the resolution.

Twyman Jones (Illinois State University): Speaking from an institution that has as our women's athletic director, one who is a very prominent officer in the women's organization, I would suggest that we not even give the impression—and I am sure that is not the intent, but we have to be very careful—we are trying to tell the women how they should run their programs without very close consultation with them.

I know last evening when I went back to my room, I got a phone call from Houston. Now, I heard a lot of other people had the same thing happen to them. I know they are extremely concerned. I think the basic thing is the impression that is being given.

I think it is a matter of public relations. I think if we want to maintain any kind of a really reasonable working relationship with the women's organization, I think we need to be exceptionally careful. I am not sure this resolution, as it is written, will allow the women to interpret in a favorable manner. For that reason, I am opposed to it right now.

Everett Phillips (Fredonia, State University College): A point of information. Is it possible to divide the resolution for voting purposes?

President Chapman: I would rule that *Whereas* doesn't mean much. You can divide the *Resolves*.

Mr. Phillips: Then I move we divide the question into two parts, namely, the first part of the resolution, and then the second part to be the last paragraph.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): I don't find too much problem with this resolution. I have worked with women's athletics in the Big Ten Conference. I have been involved with the AIAW through AAHPER; and this morning when we asked specifically the question to Ms. Gwen Gregory, could we have two different sets of rules for our student-athletes, she said there were rules for men and there were some rules for women through the AIAW, and that it would, indeed, be discriminatory. I asked the question specifically inasmuch as we will be having a conference in the Big Ten later this month between men and women.

When you look at the second portion in the resolution, *The Association is facing legal obligation to offer services and programs to women student-athletes as they do for men*, and the Council is plan-

ning to prepare a comprehensive report on the several issues. As I said before, I see no difficulty.

Mr. Thompson: I think the concern I have about defeating this resolution is that it leaves the Council without any guidance.

I want to call your attention to the second paragraph from the bottom, which is most important to me. *Be it further resolved, that the report and plan of the Council be circulated to all members not later than May 1, 1975, and, after soliciting and receiving the membership's comments, then the Council prepare whatever proposals it believes necessary and desirable for consideration by the 1976 NCAA Convention.*

I see a lot of problems if you don't pass this so we can give this proper consideration in every respect before the Council and get the membership's wishes. If we leave this Convention without adopting the resolution, I think we are in real trouble.

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I think both Mr. Swank and Mr. Morgan are right. Is it possible for the Convention to give the Council the authority to bring in a revised resolution, to work on that second *Be It Resolved* that Mr. Morgan pointed out? I think most presidents will agree that with aid and consultation this can be done. We, as an Association, face some very dire consequences under Title IX if we don't try to put our house in order.

In order to attempt to salvage it, would it not be possible for the Council in the next few hours to work in the point Mr. Morgan makes on consultation with appropriate women's groups. Perhaps the Council could furnish a draft after institutional and Association collaboration with the members and the primary membership of the women's intercollegiate athletic body. Also, perhaps the Convention could authorize the Council to have a joint study committee of both bodies, so that we all get in the same thing together and hopefully come down the track and come out on the same side.

President Chapman: I suppose it is possible for the Council to do something between now and adjournment, but it would seem very difficult to pull them off in the corner.

Mr. Horn: I think even in the mood you hear here, where people will be voting *aye* for two different reasons and *nay* for two different reasons, that in order to clarify it, it would behoove the Council to get off in the corner or have the staff to come back with something that will try to integrate some of these views.

William Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Just as a point of information, might it be possible to take a straw vote to find out how many members are actually members of AIAW and how many are not members? This certainly has an impact in terms of the NCAA offering competition to the member schools who are not members of AIAW.

President Chapman: I would generally not like to turn this into a smoke organization. This is something we can do in the Round Table, but it does seem to be inappropriate here.

Mr. Larsen: Is the Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Committee chaired by Professor Swank, still in existence?

President Chapman: Yes.

Mr. Larsen: Since that Committee has gone this far without a reso-

lution from this body, couldn't it just continue to explore the problem without a resolution, and report back either mid-year or in some basis for us to have something to work with at the next Convention? It seemed to go this far without any authority from the Convention.

President Chapman: I can't speak for next year's Council and next year's Officers.

Sam Barnes (Federal City College): I think one thing needs to be brought to the attention of this Convention, and I think historically you are in a position to do this. If you will recall, five years ago, when representatives of the women's group appeared before the NCAA, they mentioned very forcefully they wanted no intervention from the NCAA. However, legally, our attorneys have told us we had the responsibility at that time; and the word *male* was taken out of all NCAA publications, which indicated that we were favoring a women's program that had an equal opportunity.

If you will go back historically, again you will find out that the NCAA has gotten names, because it appeared to intervene in things which at times were not within its bailiwick. What I am saying here now, there is a particular resolution on the floor, even as passed, assumes again the NCAA is taking part in something which does not particularly concern it.

The only thing I would say to this Convention is there should be interest by the NCAA because they are student-athletes. Now, the women are trying to develop a program. Gentlemen, they need help. But let them decide what help they need. I would suggest that the resolution be that the Council will continue to look into the matter, show interest, but at this time not pass a resolution which appears that we are trying to intervene in an area which at times is trying to do their own work.

I think we should be aware of this and I think that some resolution, as Neils Thompson said, ought to direct the Council to have this to do, but not in the way in which it attempts to at all encroach on the women's program in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Horn: To try and bring this to a head, I am going to make what I think is an improper motion, which we can appeal to the ruling of the Chair. Let me try this language out on you and see if it will help solve the problem. This would be the second to the last Resolved clause. It would read:

Be It Further Resolved, that the report and plan of the Council be circulated to all members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women not later than May 1, 1975, and, after soliciting and receiving the memberships' comments, a joint committee of both the NCAA and the AIAW shall make recommendations for consideration by the Council which will then prepare whatever proposals it believes necessary and desirable for consideration by the 1976 NCAA Convention.

I would move the language be amended to provide for the consultation, for the distribution and for a joint committee of cooperation, and then come back to the Council who then can take all that and make a recommendation to this Convention, which any of us are free to amend when it is distributed.

President Chapman: I will rule that motion out of order. Let me explain it. I don't think we have ever done amending from the floor.

You can dispose of the matter on the floor and propose another resolution that will perhaps contain those items. We will have to dispose of what we have on the floor now. Perhaps, unfortunately, we have not ever been able to act as a committee of the whole to amend on the floor.

Mr. Horn: I appreciate that and withdraw that motion. I move that No. 168 be referred to the NCAA Council for reporting back to this Convention at a time certain, not later than 3:30 p.m. today, with similar or comparable language as that to which I have suggested.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Chapman: The motion to refer is in order. That will be putting the burden on the Council to come back.

Mr. Horn: That should take about 45 minutes.

President Chapman: Is it your intention that the Council leave the Convention?

Mr. Horn: I think the staff could draft it and the Council can sign it and circulate it. It wouldn't be that hard. We are asking for consultation, distribution and cooperation. You still have the Council's prerogative to make your recommendations after that whole consultation process has been gone through. The Convention, the member institutions, would be able to amend your proposal next year.

President Chapman: I don't see any other way to do it but to put the Convention in recess while the Council does it. Now, are you prepared to vote?

Franklin Lindeberg (University of California, Riverside): In order to solve this problem, I would recommend to the body to defeat the resolution that is in front of them at the present time; and then have President Horn submit his proposal as he has just amended it.

President Chapman: We are voting on the motion to refer.

Mr. Horn: A parliamentary inquiry, is this a proper procedure that has been suggested?

President Chapman: Resolutions can be submitted at any time. We prefer them in writing, but it doesn't always happen.

[Motion to refer Proposal No. 168 (page A-82) to the Council was defeated by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 168 was defeated by voice vote.]

Mr. Horn: To follow up the gentleman's suggestion, I believe it is now appropriate, is it not, to offer a resolution with the language proposed, which can be No. 169.

This would be the resolution that was No. 168, with the exception to the second of the last Resolved clauses, which would then read: *Be It Further Resolved, that the report and plan of the Council be circulated to all members in the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women no later than May 1, 1975, and, after soliciting and receiving the membership's comments, a joint committee of both the NCAA and the AIAW shall make recommendations for consideration by the Council, and then the Council shall prepare whatever proposals it believes necessary and desirable for consideration by the 1976 NCAA Convention.*

[The motion was seconded.]

Roy Whistler (Purdue University): There is one point in this reso-

lution which does not seem to me to be appropriate. That is that the resolution calls for a joint committee between we and the women. I don't know that we can commit them to such a committee.

Mr. Horn: I don't know either, but we can make the offer. At that point the ball is in their court.

[Proposal No. 169 (page A-83) was approved by voice vote.]

Restitution

Mr. Swank: I am sure glad the Council assigns me all the easy ones. [Laughter] Mr. President, I move the adoption of Item No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment to the Enforcement Procedure would enable the Council to take one of several specific actions against a member institution which gained something improperly.

What this amendment seems to do is require that there be fairness to the other institutions. We have talked a great deal about fairness in certain performers. If an institution uses an ineligible athlete, then the Council could take certain action.

I would point out that this is not a *shall* but a *may* situation. Obviously, it would depend upon the type of ability, I suppose, that the individual performer had. I am sure that in some instances there would be very little contribution by that individual for the overall performance of the team or the group. If there is, then of course, they could take this action. I would urge its adoption.

[Proposal No. 63 (page A-33) was approved by voice vote.]

Penalty Structure

Jack Sawyer (Wake Forest University): At the request of the Council, I move the adoption of No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is one of those extremely, legal technicalities, which probably will be better presented by a lawyer. The idea here is, as you know, the NCAA is an organization of institutions rather than individuals. We have run into some difficulty legally in saying that we can enforce specific actions directly from the Infractions Committee to a student without any violation by the institution.

For example, a student is declared eligible by an institution. His eligibility would have to be taken away by his institution and not by the Infractions Committee. This will have no effect on the infractions procedure, but it will simply keep us from getting in legal difficulties.

[Proposal No. 64 (page A-35) was approved by voice vote.]

Institutional Eligibility

Ferdinand Geiger (Brown University): I move the adoption of Item No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to require each athletic department staff member to sign an annual statement concerning rules violations as a part of the chief executive officer's annual certification.

John Harbaugh (Stanford University): I object to the rather loose language phrase that is used in this. The athletic staff member covers many people, such as trainers, team physicians, groundskeepers and equipment managers. Surely, it is not the intent to include these people. I presume the Council would have to make the interpretation.

Mr. Geiger: Yes, the Council would have to interpret this, as to whom it would involve. I would say perhaps trainers and physicians, but not groundskeepers.

[Proposal No. 65 (page A-35) was defeated by Division I, 68-129, and by Division II and Division III, each by voice vote.]

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Am I right in this, that the coach does not have to sign?

President Chapman: I believe that is right.

Mr. Broyles: Well, I would like to move to reconsider that motion in regard to No. 65.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

I just don't believe as a football coach that I can look at myself, gentlemen, and say that I am going to ask the player to sign and the president to sign and not ask the staff and the athletic director of the school to sign. I just can't believe that that is what we are wanting to do.

If we are looking for deterrents against the abuses and ways to strengthen ourselves against the abuses, then we would vote this way. I am appealing to you to give me as a coach—I don't know how many other active coaches are here but I would like to hear from them—a chance to tell my staff they are going to have to sign. I am going to sign it, and I want them to sign it. My players are going to sign it, and my president is going to sign it.

Don Warhurst (California State Polytech University): Our institutions, and I assume most of the others, currently are having coaches and athletic directors sign such statements. This piece of legislation certainly could be interpreted, as has been pointed out, as anyone connected with the department. I thought what we saw in the vote was not the concept we don't want coaches to sign, but that the institutions are requiring this already, and they don't need this piece of legislation to get them to do what is obviously proper in the first place.

Mr. Broyles: I feel the first person the president is going to look to is the athletic director to assure him the program is being run correctly. As the athletic director, I do not know all the things that are going on. I want assurances from my coaches. Our president absolutely refuses to sign that petition unless our coaches sign it, and I think it is in order to do that.

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): I would like to know if this is in order? Is it possible to make the editorial change of using the general coaching staff members and athletic directors, rather than the general terminology that is used here?

President Chapman: I would say it would be possible. I do think it is too much, probably, of an editorial change to make from the floor. The Council can make note of it and will be guided by the discussion that has gone on from the floor. I don't know any other way to do it.

Cliff Speagle (Southwest Athletic Conference): I think we would be remiss as delegates to this Convention to not be consistent in all respects in the rules that we have laid down.

Mr. Harbaugh: There is another element here that I find objectionable. The bold face type in the following phrase, *Has reported his knowledge of*. Now, I dare say that every coach has some knowledge of violations elsewhere, in various degrees and rumors.

Is it the intention of the proposers of this legislation to require him to report this knowledge and violations outside his institutions? It seems to me it is not. They actually want him to report his own involvement in the violations but not others. Maybe I am wrong.

President Chapman: I presume you are correct.

Mr. Geiger: I believe the legislation clearly says your own institution.

[Upon reconsideration, Proposal No. 65 (page A-35) was approved by each division by show of paddles.]

President Chapman: You see what happens when Broyles wakes up. [Laughter]

Personnel

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): In behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Item No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

Very briefly, this would amend Recommended Policy 6. This is a good management procedure.

[Proposal No. 67 (page A-36) was approved by voice vote.]

Obligations of Membership

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment is offered because especially in the public institutions—but even increasingly in the private institutions—courts, state laws, boards of trustees and academic university centers have insisted on some known procedure of due process in the case of the infractions by students, be they student academic or athletic affairs, or any other aspect of the university.

This proposed language would state that if a student-athlete were ineligible under our Constitution, Bylaws or other legislation, prior to the ax falling on that student-athlete—who might later be found to be innocent either by the NCAA Committee on Eligibility or the courts—the student-athlete, just as any other human being in our Anglo-Saxon judicial oriented society, would have to receive notice and have an opportunity for a hearing with respect to his ineligibility.

In order to keep an institution from fudging on this, we wrote in a 30-day limitation for a due process hearing. If a student-athlete is accused of something and the institution immediately rules him ineligible and it takes time for the NCAA hearing apparatus, you have students running off to the courts to get a temporary restraining order. This is to make sure that the student-athlete gets a hearing and not be deprived of a fourth of his amateurism life and in no case could that decision take more than 30 days.

William Matthews (University of Kentucky): Despite the lateness of the hour and despite the obvious support that President Horn has generated for his thoughtful proposal, as I read that and understand this proposed amendment, it seems to suggest that there is some relationship in due process between the NCAA and the student-athlete. O.I. 20 does not speak to the loss of ineligibility through infractions by the institution. This is the basic O.I. that places on the institution the obligation to determine eligibility without ever coming to the Infractions Committee or coming through that process.

There is a legal gap, perhaps, whether eligibility is a status or whether loss of natural ability is a sanction. Now, my basic concern and what I draw to the attention of all the delegates here, is that opposing this amendment will not reduce one iota the institutional obligation to provide full and due process to the student, because the student's relationship runs to the institution.

Admittedly, the proposed amendment has some kind of 30-day savings. Taking into account this is the O.I. that results in self-executing determination of eligibility out of the institution, I feel that this amounts to a 30-day delay in all institutionally determined eligibility matters. I don't believe in using lightly phrases before this big of a group. But this sounds like a 30-day ineligibility entitlement to play. I think that runs against the whole thrust of the carefully conceived existing legislation, based very carefully, as President Horn recognized this morning in some of his other proposals, on the maintenance of a separation of relationships insofar as the NCAA's running its relationships even at the due process directly to the student.

I would urge this proposal not be adopted.

Mr. Horn: If Proposal No. 68 is not adopted, is Proposal No. 69 to amend the Enforcement Procedures still in order, or does it need the Constitutional sanction? These are similar proposals to get at the same problem.

President Chapman: They are similar, but I don't believe No. 69 depends upon No. 68.

Mr. Horn: I think No. 69 might more clearly meet your objection.

Mr. Matthews: No, I have the same objection to No. 69 when we get to it.

Mr. Horn: It says where a penalty is to be imposed on a student-athlete or staff member, it implies the action of the Committee on Infractions. We are not talking, in either No. 68 or No. 69, about an institution in the normal course of it determining eligibility getting an extra 30 days. What we are talking about is when the NCAA makes certain findings in a long list of allegations. The student-athlete deserves the right to notice, to due process in a hearing like every other type of penalty that is levied on a university campus, and should not be instantly ruled ineligible. The student-athlete could go to court, and if the institution wants to—we didn't—you could take both the NCAA and the institution to court and get in complicated state actions.

I think the 30 days is very short. All of you from the universities know that most committees can't finish anything for five months, and this is including disciplinary hearings.

Mr. Matthews: I understand what you are saying. This is one of the situations, as I understand it, where the institution has a dual obligation. The institution has the obligation of running to the student providing due process, but the institution also has the obligation to be in conformance with NCAA legislation. This is under the heading Obligations of Membership.

I would agree with you that if you think your duty to provide due process to the student outweighs your duty to be in conformance with the NCAA legislation, but I think for some period of time you may very well be not in conformance with the NCAA legislation in

the discharge of your duty to the student in providing the due process.

My concern and the concern I draw to the attention of the Convention is that this, as now proposed, runs to situations where that dilemma does not have to be faced. It does, in effect, result in treating all clear, factual cases of ineligibility not resulting from institutional infraction, as if you could be in conformance with the NCAA membership obligation legislation for a period of 30 days when you know, as a matter of incontrovertible fact, your student-athlete is ineligible.

I am not suggesting that this Convention take any action to back off of due process. But this is one of the tough choices in most observations that the institution has made in order to discharge its dual duties as fairly as it can, both to the student and to the other members of this Association against whom its team is just about to compete.

Mr. Horn: May I respond by saying I think the proof of the pudding is what is the current institutional practice. Obviously, in rulings on eligibility, none of us, to my knowledge, use the student disciplinary procedures. We do use them where there is an accusation that a record has been falsified, such as an ACT test, or whatever, a false signature. This would be the accusation in the case of one of our student-athletes. We can't accuse that student of that without a fair hearing. It isn't a question of his eligibility, it is a question of the serious offense such as a falsification of records.

[Proposal No. 68 (page A-37) was defeated by show of paddles.]

Institutional Hearing

Mr. Horn: In light of that action, I am going to withdraw No. 69 and revise it, and come back to next year's Convention and tie it down along the gentleman's suggestion.

[Proposal No. 69 (page A-37) was withdrawn.]

Football Rules Committee

Lloyd Milam (University of Southern Mississippi): Because of the lateness of the day and so many of us having to leave, I move that we discuss Nos. 103 and 104 as soon as convenient to the Chair.

[The motion was seconded.]

Wendell Basye (University of Oregon): I certainly recognize the right of anyone to ask that No. 104 be brought before the Convention. I don't believe that at the lateness of this hour we are going to develop much meaningful input by discussion of the single platoon football. As a sponsor of No. 104, I would request that we have permission to withdraw them.

President Chapman: Is there any objection to the withdrawal of No. 104? It will be withdrawn. Is the mover of that motion willing to withdraw his motion?

Mr. Milam: I certainly would accept withdrawal of No. 104.

President Chapman: Do you want to discuss No. 103 now, or what?

Mr. Milam: I would like to discuss No. 103 and No. 104, but the gentleman said he would like to withdraw it.

President Chapman: You have a motion on the floor to change the order. Do you still want to pursue that motion?

Mr. Milam: Yes, unless he withdraws it.

President Chapman: He withdrew it. Do you want to withdraw your motion to change the order?

Mr. Milam: Yes, sir.

[Proposal No. 104 (page A-54) and the motion to change the order of the agenda both were withdrawn.]

Resolution: Enforcement Procedures

President Chapman: Proposals 70 and 71 are two matters that deal with enforcement which President Horn has submitted. It is my understanding there has been some discussion with President Horn and the Council on areas where we differed on those items. Because of the lateness of the procedure, it was not possible to get appropriate amendments in there. What the Council has done is generate a resolution which appears as No. 149. With the permission of the Convention, if we would introduce No. 149 at this time it might clarify action subsequently on Nos. 70 and 71, depending on what happens to No. 149.

George Ilg (California State University, Fresno): In behalf of the Council, I would like to move the adoption of No. 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

This particular resolution would become effective immediately, and in the case of violations it would send to the violator a compilation of all of the penalties and the infractions involved in that particular case.

Mr. Horn: Where it says in the second to the last *Resolved* clause that the eligibility rules will be applied or will be specified, is it the intent of this resolution to also list here the names of the players who have been cited previously throughout the infractions reports under that rule which is to be applied so that the institution specifically knows, based on the previous action, with whom they have to deal.

Mr. Ilg: Yes.

Mr. Horn: In that case, I would support the resolution, and then I would withdraw Nos. 70 and 71.

[Proposal No. 149 (page A-74) was approved by voice vote.]

[Proposals No. 70 and No. 71 (pages A-37 and A-38) were withdrawn.]

Enforcement Policy

J. H. McNish (University of Kansas): I move the adoption of No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would presume there would be wide support for the general objective. The intent is to preclude the levying of broad penalties affecting all student-athletes as a basic policy of the NCAA enforcement program.

Jack Sawyer (Wake Forest University): I must raise the same objection to this that I did to No. 72. This would prohibit us from placing an institution's team for a sport on probation regardless of how many violations occurred in that sport. I need to make the same comment about Nos. 73 and 74.

Phillip Sheridan (Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference): I move, in light of the confusion, Proposal No. 73 be tabled.

[The motion was seconded and approved. Proposal No. 73 (page A-39) was tabled by voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 74 (page A-40) was regularly made, seconded and tabled by voice vote.]

Maximum Awards

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): I move we change the order of business right now. I move we deal with Proposal No. 82 before Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): I move No. 82 be approved by this Convention, which amends Bylaw Article 5, Section 5-(c) and (d).

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this amendment is to eliminate the initial awards limits in the sports of football and basketball in Division I but to retain the present limitations on the total number of awards which may be in effect at any one time in those sports.

This is proposed on the basis of the problems involved in determining additional awards and the problems involved with many institutions in ever reaching the maximum in the number of awards in football particularly.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I would like to speak in opposition to this amendment. We have not given our present rule a fair test. I have been in coaching for 28 years, and this is the way the coaches' minds work. This particular amendment works to bring in as many as you want the first year. We have a one-year rule. We keep them and turn them out. As long as we are under the abstract figure of 105, we are all right. I cannot live with this as a coach and never have been able to live with an overall limit without an initial limit.

In fact, my feeling is that the initial limit is the only one that is really important, because, as he has just said, we are going to be under 105; but this doesn't mean you have to have 105. I just think it is the tail wagging the head. I can't believe this is what we as educators teaching want to stress.

I want to be sure I am speaking to the right group because I can't believe it. My recruiting budget will be double. I will make that statement right here. I think this is going backwards.

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): Speaking in behalf of the Council, I understand that the Pacific Coast Athletic Association has a problem from the standpoint of the junior college and percentage of junior college transfers. The Council opposes this in terms of its general effects upon the programs in various schools. The runoff that is there, particularly with the one-year grant, relieves the academic pressure. I think that is enough to indicate the very great opposition of the Council.

Mr. Morgan: Frank, with all due respect, I think Divisions II and III have gone to this. We have gone to it in every other sport except football and basketball. We happened to believe that there are sports that are important other than football and basketball. It is working in those sports, and it was my feeling that the faculty and the people who worked financial aid are really responsible for the athletic programs and the financial aid as such. If an individual coach is going to participate in the runoff, then the faculty member at that institution ought to be able to correct that as well as the president.

I really am not so concerned about that as I am about the tremendous amount of legislation that we have accumulated in one year on the initial award. We have more in our book now, and we are fast approaching more O.I.s and more legislation than we had with the 1.6. Thus, I would like to simplify it and go to 105 and 18.

Mr. Broyles: I know that the hour is late, but I don't see the reference between the size of the stadium and the interest that is going to be generated from a coach who can—and I don't mean to use the word J. D. did—run them off, I mean the one-year scholarship and not renew them. I apologize for that.

I think the limit on the initial grant and cutting down to 30 is the greatest step forward that I have seen in coaching in our rules, because our conference, for instance, had 45. I was against the initial grant. Now I am the strongest advocate and would support less. I think that is all we need.

Mr. Hill: Frank, in all due respect, I coached football at USC from '51 through '56 and was director of athletics from '57 through '71. We had an institutional self-imposed limitation on financial aid. We had a limitation of a total of 205. Each sport had a certain number. Football had 110 on full grants. In all those years, we ran from 87 to 107.

The institution took over the problem and I, as the administrator, had to run the red-shirts and the rest. We did not have problems in those respects. As far as runoffs and red-shirts were concerned, I don't believe we ever had more than two or three or four red-shirts in football any one time during those years. I only can say from my experience in administering such a program, that if the will is there, it can be done.

[Proposal No. 82 (page A-43) was defeated by Division I by show of paddles.]

Countable Players

Stanley Marshall (South Dakota State University): In behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of No. 75 is to plug the loop hole, if you like, in institutions where they have 105 student-athletes on football aid, plus another number under assorted aid such as EOG, BEOG, work study, and various other need programs.

Royce Flippin (Princeton University): There is an amendment to be offered. No. 150 is a proposed amendment to No. 75, subparagraph a. I so move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the proposers of No. 150, we would remind the membership you look to the institution to maintain freshman programs. As is set out in No. 150, the only change would be (b) *He was recruited and is receiving financial aid as set forth in O.I. 500 and engages in intercollegiate competition in that sport other than as a member of the institution's freshman team.*

As I have stated, No. 150 will amend No. 75 and is offered only to protect those of us with freshman programs, who will be unable to function under No. 73 as written and offered. I would like to point out while we offer this amendment and are sympathetic to those concerns and with the use of the JV level, we must state further that we

are against any change in the present O.I. 500 that states a student-athlete must be counted. We would like to keep that.

No. 75 must include No. 150 before this Convention, or our freshman programs are in grave trouble. We feel this body has done a disservice to our freshman athletes and to those who are still uncertain and worried about JV abuse.

Mr. Marshall: The Council supports No. 150, feeling we can do what we want to with that amendment.

[Proposal No. 150 (page A-75) was approved by Division I and Division II, each by show of paddles.]

Simply in behalf of the Council, we feel No. 75 will assist in enforcing our 105 regulation, and we feel the amendment helps those institutions with the problem, and we urge your support.

[Proposal No. 75 (page A-40) was defeated by Division I and Division II by single show of paddles.]

Countable Players

Mr. Marshall: I move the adoption of Item No. 76.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): We discussed this at the Round Table and had an objection to the words *freshman team* in there. This would preclude the youngster from participating in sub-varsity or junior varsity teams.

When the question was asked specifically at the Round Table, if it would be, all the answer I got was that it was the freshman team and not the JV team. If you vote for this, it would mean under O.I. 501 or under that provision, you would not be able to participate in the JV team if you reached your limit. I urge you to vote against No. 76.

[Proposal No. 76 (page A-41) was defeated by Division I and Division II by single show of paddles.]

Countable Players

Hal Lahar (Southwest Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Item No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of No. 77 is to assure those players who become accountable under O.I. 501 are counted in the maximum initial awards when the competition takes place.

[Proposal No. 77 (page A-41) was approved by Division I and Division II by single voice vote.]

Initial Awards—Football and Basketball

Harry Troxell (Colorado State University): I move the adoption of No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): This would take an individual that was given aid in some other sport other than basketball or football and count him in the initial award category when he first participates.

[Proposal No. 78 (page A-42) was approved by Division I and Division II by single voice vote.]

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): In behalf of the Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

This provides for both practice and competition. The concern we have is that an award, for example, in track, is given to an individual who comes out and practices and in effect is being given a tryout in practicing football. From this standpoint it serves as a rule of participation. It is a very significant loophole, and the Council has a great deal of concern. A number of suggestions in this regard have been made to the Council. From that standpoint, the Council feels the word *practice* should be inserted.

Mr. Broyles: I would like to see this adopted. If we don't, it can serve as a hide-out where you can bring in a boy in wrestling and other sports; and he can still practice football. If you don't use all of the rest of the scholarships, he can practice football until he gets ready to be on varsity or prove he is a good player; and then you put in as your maximum table where he should be initially. I strongly favor this. I think 90 per cent of the coaches do.

Mr. Morgan: When an athlete competes at the varsity level and we upgrade from the other sports, it would seem to me while there might be some problems with practices—it would be a combination of football or wrestling or a basketball and football player—just because he practices, to make a charge against that initial award seems to me totally unfair. Now, when he competes, there isn't any question about it.

Cliff Speegle (Southwest Conference): I think the opportunity of tryout is eliminated by Proposal No. 79 in any manner, shape or form. I think this is what we are interested in, is closing those loopholes.

[Proposal No. 79 (page A-42) was approved by Division I and Division II, each by show of paddles.]

Multiple Sports Participants

John Kaiser (St. John's University): I would like to move that we adopt No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to apply the counting provisions to competition on the varsity level only for multiple sport participants, thus permitting such student-athletes to participate at the sub-varsity level without counting against the maximum awards limitations in football or basketball.

Mr. Thompson: In behalf of the Council, I should like to oppose this because we are quite concerned about the fact that this attempts to destroy the limitation that we are now having on awards. Of course, it would permit individuals to be available on the varsity and sub-varsity. Thus, again, in the tryout area, it would be harboring players and athletes. This is our main concern in this particular area. I think we appreciate the commentary that was presented.

Mr. Kaiser: I would like to reiterate my concern for the student-athlete who is qualified for sub-varsity or freshman play, academically sound and prevented from competition by our present rule.

Richard Gibney (Boston University): You know, we see this tryout as a terrible thing. We are not talking about a high school student. We are talking about a student here who is in our college. Every student in that college is trying out for the team. So what is wrong with baseball player who has a baseball scholarship trying out

for the basketball team? What is wrong in not counting him until he plays on a varsity team? I don't see why you should restrict this competition to students in your school.

Then, again, you have got to count him. If you don't count him that year playing sub-varsity and you are going to play him on the varsity team the next year, you have to count him in the initial award. You are not being penalized, and you are not getting that much advantage.

President Chapman: Wait just a minute. I need to consult with the parliamentarian.

George Ilg (California State University, Fresno): What happens to No. 79 if No. 80 passes?

President Chapman: That is what I was discussing with the parliamentarian, and we have not figured it out.

The parliamentarian rules, and I concur, with the passage of No. 79, No. 80 is out of order. The only way to do this is to reconsider No. 79 and defeat it, and substitute No. 80 for it. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Francis Reinzo (Georgetown University): I would like to inquire what a sub-varsity team is in light of No. 35 (b)-(c), which defines a varsity team as any team which engages in outside competition, including the sophomore or senior or a student who academically classifies as a freshman who has been in college residency two semesters or three quarters. I thought by virtue of that we had eliminated the terminology subvarsity from the Constitution.

President Chapman: You will have to ask those that used the term. I don't think that is appropriate on the floor right now.

The Chair rules No. 80 out of order.

Mr. Kaiser: I move for reconsideration of No. 79.

[The motion was seconded and defeated by voice vote.]

Basketball Contests

Norval Ritchey (Oregon University): I would like to ask we now consider a change in the order of legislation, and would like to consider No. 122 at this time. Therefore, I so move.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Peter Carlesimo (Fordham University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 122.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think we should remind the membership that the legislation is permissive. The right of self-determination exists, and we do not have to play 27 games. I also believe that the present legislation might be considered discriminatory. With the exception of football, there is no limit on the number of games we play in other sports. I think this is inconsistent. We can schedule games with foreign teams and not have it count in the total. The present legislation creates a hardship at Fordham University. Like most of you, we schedule three or four years in advance. We have scheduled 26 games. During the past year, the Eastern College Athletic Conference has divided our group and established qualifications for the NCAA championships. This is all very desirable, but as a result we are now confronted with the problem of the 27 games. It may be embarrassing for us to ask during the next few years institutions to release us from a signed contract.

We know the additional game means additional revenue. We are favorable to tournaments. You set aside a few games and are only able to play two. For all these reasons, we urge the membership to approve this in order to alleviate a problem that exists in the East, and I understand also in other sections of the country. I know I speak for many other institutions.

Finally, I would like it known I am recording all dissenting votes. I have made this proposal one I don't think they can turn down. [Laughter]

James Hawkins (Fort Valley State College): I would like very quickly to say just a few words in opposition to the 27-game schedule. I think this is the third or fourth time that it has been voted down. It makes the season longer for all three divisions. In light of the fact that we have playoffs, tournaments and conference events, we would like to go on record as saying nay to a 27-game basketball schedule.

[Proposal No. 122 (page A-61) was defeated by Division I, 98-114; by Division II, 37-63, and by Division III, 22-40.]

Maximum Awards

John Mahlstede (Iowa State University): I move we adopt Proposal No. 81 which amends Bylaw Article 5, Section 5-(c).

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment changes the maximum initial awards from 30 to 35, and inserts the phrase, *With no more than 60 in any two-year period*. It also retains the 105 maximum awards in effect the same year.

The intent of this legislation is to provide added flexibility to the current limitations regarding initial awards in the sport of football, without increasing the number of initial awards permitted in a two-year period.

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): In behalf of the Council, I will state the opposition is primarily based upon the fact that they have really not had time to assess the present situation and there doesn't seem to be any pressing need to make this change.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): The intent of the rule, I think, may have been misconstrued by the way it was presented. It does not, in fact, increase the annual number to 35, but it increases the number, over a two-year period, of 60 to a maximum, and to any one year to 35. The reason for the suggestion is to allow a little more flexibility. Currently, I would assume if you investigated the number of people your football coaches took, very few of them, in fact, did take a full 30. It is very difficult to arrive at that number.

[Proposal No. 81 (page A-43) was defeated by Division I by show of paddles.]

[Proposal No. 83 (page A-44) was ruled out of order.]

Delegate: The Utah State people had to leave. I am going to express the sentiments of the proposal. They are not necessarily mine. I move that Proposal No. 84 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is to allow greater flexibility in the initial awards. The thinking is it would apply an overall limit on the value of awards which may be in effect at any one time in the sport of basketball and this might

be a financial savings to the institution.

[Proposal No. 84 (page A-44) was defeated by Division I and Division II by single voice vote.]

Maximum Awards

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): I move the adoption of Item No. 85, Part A, which amends Constitution Article 3, Section 4-(e).

[The motion was seconded.]

Stephen Goodspeed (University of California, Santa Barbara): As an executive of an institution, I am well aware of the financial problem that all of us face. But I can't, in all honesty, face my students, coaches and certainly not my director of athletics, and say we have two classes of student-athletes—to say nothing of the women. I urge in the strongest fashion possible this motion be defeated and seek other ways of conserving our resources in economies.

Mr. Holmes: The proposal that is before the Convention at this point is the Constitutional amendment. It is enabling legislation placing before this Convention an opportunity to consider, whether at this time or a future Convention, limitation of financial aid can be based on value.

We already have value on numbers. This proposal places before us the opportunity to consider whether we want to base financial aid on value. I think regardless of your view on the bylaw portion of this proposal, whether it be positive or negative, the Constitutional action must be taken to provide this organization the flexibility regarding financial aid necessary for the continued existence.

[Part A of Proposal No. 85 (page A-45) was defeated by show of paddles; therefore, Part B ruled out of order.]

Maximum Awards

Harry Troxell (Colorado State University): No. 86 is to amend Bylaw Article 5, Section 5-(b), and to combine swimming and water polo as one sport as far as the number of grants in aid. I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

J. D. Morgan (UCLA): I have done quite an extensive survey in the correlation between swimming and water polo. In the past two Olympic years, including the Olympic tryout team, of the total members, only three young men that participated in water polo ever made a qualifying time for an NCAA championship.

In a time when we have finally gotten our water polo up on the international level, achieved the bronze medal and were within one goal of winning the gold medal, I would hate to see the sport of water polo crippled by this type of legislation. The two sports are totally different, and the only thing that is similar is the water. It would be like combining basketball and soccer.

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): I would also like to speak against this amendment. We find that these two sports are distinct and different. Many individuals participate in one and do not participate in the other. I urge you to vote this down.

[Proposal No. 86 (page A-46) was defeated by Division I and Division II by single voice vote.]

Maximum Awards

William Exum (Kentucky State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is obvious. The same will be true for No. 88. It is a change of word and removes it to the equivalency bracket for those in Division No. II.

[Proposal No. 87 (page A-46) was approved by institutions which play football in Division II, by show of paddles.]

Maximum Awards

Mr. Exum: I move the adoption of No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 88 (page A-46) was approved by Division II by show of paddles.]

[Proposals No. 89, No. 90 and No. 152 were withdrawn.]

Financial Aid Definition

Stanley Marshall (South Dakota State University): I move, in behalf of the Council, for the adoption of No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is to provide consistency with our Constitution that has been set forth in Article 3-4-(b). Loans are not shown. This first showed up in our legislative materials when we adopted the numbers. I don't believe it was ever the intent to include them. We have not done so traditionally. This is in an attempt to clean up our manual. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 91 (page A-48) was approved by Division I and Division II by single voice vote.]

Financial Aid—Employment

John Winkin (University of Maine, Orono): In behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

This simply amends the Constitution as indicated, and it defines the term involved in financial aid, including summer sessions.

[Proposal No. 92 (page A-48) was approved by voice vote.]

Recruiting Benefits

William Exum (Kentucky State University): I move Proposal No. 93 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

There is No. 165, an amendment to this proposal which takes into account those questions raised at the General Round Table.

The general intent of this Proposal No. 93 is to make more precise the matter of recruiting benefits by prohibiting all financial aid, benefits or arrangements during recruiting unless specifically permitted by governing legislation.

The question at the General Round Table ran to the matter of institutionally administered student loans and work study programs, and No. 165 is designed to meet that particular matter.

I move Amendment No. 165 amending Proposal No. 93 be adopted at this time.

[The motion was seconded.]

Stephen Horn (California State University, Long Beach): Perhaps No. 165 covers this, but would this preclude the director of financial

aid contacting a university's athletic foundation or the director of student part-time employment and stopping aid, other than athletic aid, to student-athletes?

Mr. Exum: In my judgment, it could not.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): Unless he is by other legislation an athletic representative of the institution.

President Chapman: May I ask Oregon's intention on No. 153, which was also an amendment to this?

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): It is the intention of Oregon State to withdraw No. 153, if this is permissible.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): For clarification, I don't know if you can promise a young athlete a summer job. I would like to know.

Mr. Exum: As I understand it, you cannot offer him a summer job; but that does not mean you can't make known to him the institutional work study program.

I want Coach Broyles to understand me. We are not saying you can't offer him a summer job after he is enrolled.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): I would make this point from a good deal of exposure to the recruitment process and the rules that apply. We do have from time to time rules made that are totally unworkable related to the recruiting process. This is one. To assume that a coach may locate employment after an athlete's enrollment and the completion of his sophomore year and so forth, but may not prior to that time is not, in fact, going to exercise it right away. By passing this proposal, you will have a calamity. There would be violations.

[Proposal No. 165 (page A-81) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Mr. Davis: In view of the fact that the previous amendment has failed, I would like to then reverse my decision earlier on the withdrawal of No. 153 and introduce No. 153. I move the adoption of No. 153.

[The motion was seconded.]

The current Proposal No. 93 does include the word *employment* or *loans*. As I interpret this, and I got it from the discussion with the Council, you would be precluded from arranging for any on-campus appointments, such as work study programs. You would be precluded from arranging for loans for the student during the time that you are recruiting. I don't think we can do that for any student, particularly those that are part of the EOT program. Therefore, I recommend the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

Harry Troxell (Colorado State University): I would like to raise an objection to this on the part of the Council, because I think that under some of the courses there to introduce some loan arrangements would be, in certain events, the real issue and would make it difficult to administer.

[Proposal No. 153 (page A-76) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

President Chapman: That leaves us with No. 93 in its unamended state. Is there any discussion on the Proposal No. 93?

Mr. Crowder: I would just mention again this proposal does have in it you may not assist a youngster in locating a summer job. I do

think that we do have occasion from time to time to make a rule that cannot prevent what it suggests it is trying to prevent, and it cannot be missed. This is one of them, I am convinced.

Recruiting Visitations

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): The Pacific-8 Conference wishes to withdraw Proposition No. 94.

President Chapman: Is there any opposition?

Carl James (Duke University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 94 as written.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ted Kearly (Michigan Technological University): There are several super-powers in the country; and should they choose to monopolize the visitations and shut out the rest of us, they could do it. They also have an additional avenue if they choose to use it by using O.I. 106, bonafide alumni associations. I think this is bad legislation.

Hal Lahar (Southwest Athletic Conference): I think that the principle of No. 94 is excellent, but I don't see how it can be enforced. I think particularly the institution is going to be penalized apparently for a student-athlete that has misrepresented his position. I think there would be a lot of opposition.

[Proposal No. 94 (page A-49) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Recruiting Contacts

Bob James (Atlantic Coast Conference and Special Committee on Recruiting): I move the adoption of Item No. 95 which amends Bylaw Article 1, Section 1-(b).

[The motion was seconded.]

We advised the Round Table we continue to receive an abnormal amount of complaints from high school coaches concerning our recruiters and intrusion into their programs at a time when they do not feel that they are mature enough to resist the limitations.

Last year we voted this proposition down. I think one of the principal concerns for the membership at that time was that many institutions felt that they could not call sufficiently well to the attention of the prospect academic requirements of the institution. In talking with high schools about this, they feel their counselors are well qualified to perform this service.

This legislation simply restricts your recruiters from in-person contact. It in no way restricts the mail or telephoning to the young man to call his attention to these particular concerns. We feel very strongly this will be a most desirable legislation.

Mr. Broyles: I would like to speak in favor and appeal to the people to help us get out and exercise this recruiting privilege.

Philip Erdle (U.S. Air Force Academy): I would like to speak for a brief moment on behalf of all the service academies and make the colleges aware this legislation would put our programs in an untenable situation or position. I am not speaking against the legislation, necessarily, as much as to inform you that we would have to seek immediate redress through the Council since most of our cadet recruitment, not just athletes, starts in the second semester of the junior year in which some of the physical exams take place. The Air Force officer contacts them, and it would be construed as athletic

contact. The second phase is that we know we operate under a number of O.I.s or exceptions. We want the membership to know we appreciate those exceptions and we don't abuse them.

We will again have to seek an exception in case this legislation passes.

Robert Peck (Williams College): I would like to point out one thing. I am in sympathy with what the Committee has said, and I think it has gotten out of hand. I would like to point out some of us in Division III have urged strict recruiting rules at our schools. Our ambition is a January 1 deadline. This does give us a chance to talk to the junior student. I wish the legislation had been proposed in some way that provided for the things that Frank Broyles had in mind, but would allow us also to talk with some junior students at an alone night, not in the high school. I just wanted to make the Convention aware of this.

Father E. P. Joyce (University of Notre Dame): I would like to express one slight misgiving about the way this is written, because I have a feeling that we might get into some of the same problems that Ed Crowder mentioned earlier about the enforcement of this particular provision. The phrase I am concerned about is that rather broad phrase covering the other representatives of institutions' athletic interests.

I raise this same point at this time, the same as I did last year when this particular provision was defeated because it seems to me that you are not going to be able to avoid alumni and friends from talking to young men when they are sophomores and juniors in high school.

If this is going to be construed by any NCAA group as being in violation of this particular provision, I think we have serious problems and are doing more harm than happiness by not defeating it. I feel that the coaches and the people really involved in recruiting should be allowed these visits during the junior year, but I would just hope that that could be clarified or else a very liberal interpretation might be given to the institution representative's athletic interest. I don't think it is fair to put that burden on the coach.

If the coach has any knowledge of a friend or an alumnus ever talking to a kid, that makes that person who talked to the boy a representative of the university's interest. Again, I do have misgivings about this from this point of view.

John Cobb (Texas Technical University): I would like to speak in support of this amendment. I feel that you are innovative athletic coaches and can very adequately represent yourselves at the end of the junior year. We do not need to infringe upon the young people, neither boys nor girls, during their junior year.

Fred Shabel (University of Pennsylvania): I certainly understand Mr. Broyles support of this, because there is a little bit of analogy to this one and the one we just eliminated when we admitted that so many of us don't have the national attention, the publicity or the programs that a very small group of schools in this country have. I think to just assume that we are going to wait until the senior year to introduce some of the educational programs in the institutions that most of us are representing, I think it would be a great mistake.

I do understand, however, there is an economic approach to this;

but I don't think it has been written properly by virtue of taking into consideration all of the needs that most of us, and I repeat, most of us have on this floor. I would vote strongly against this, and possibly we can take it back to the drawing board and give us all something we can work with.

Corey Van Fleet (Oakland University): I am concerned about those sports in which there is national junior olympic competition. Colleges are at those and come in contact before athletes reach the junior year. In fact many boys and a number of girls reach international level in swimming prior to their ever getting into high school. I don't know how you are going to stop this kind of contact with this rule. I think that it will end up in subterfuge all over the place.

Mr. Broyles: It would be a big help to us at football schools, and it might handicap some of those that maybe don't recruit in the fall. We have had that in our conference as long as I have been a coach there. We have never had any problem with it.

Our coaches, to my knowledge, haven't been accused of breaking it. I think I would hear about it if they were accused of it. We feel that it is important legislation in two or three ways, but the fact is that we save a great deal of money.

John Pont (Northwestern University): The point was made yesterday in the Round Table that the principals would close the door on us if we don't do something on our own accord. I have just spent four weeks recruiting. The reception we are getting, both from the principals and counselors, is one that is totally negative when you see six, seven or eight coaches lined up in the corridor. This is occurring in the junior year.

I am afraid if we don't take action here the high schools will take action against us, and it will be that much more difficult to get the grades in the fall.

[Proposal No. 95 (page A-49) was approved by each division by show of paddles.]

Recruiting Contacts

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): In behalf of the Pacific-8 Conference, I move the adoption of No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

I wish at this time to move Proposal No. 154 to amend No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reason for the amendment is to clarify a technical error in the original No. 96. No. 154 refers to the limitation of contacts by the institution which was the intention of the legislation, whereas, the original No. 96 referred to staff members. If you had 100 staff members you presumably would have 300 cases for recruiting which was an error. We meant to refer to the number of the contacts with the institution. That is the reason for the amendment.

[Proposal No. 154 (page A-76) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Mr. Davis: The intentions of No. 96, as amended, are pretty high. We feel that the excesses in recruiting are rather serious in inter-collegiate athletics, and we feel the costs of recruiting are bearing down on us. For that reason, we feel we ought to have some restrictions on recruiting that would be reasonable.

The legislation does not preclude your institution's contacting stu-

dents for academic purposes or for the pursuance of educational programs. We recognize the problems in administration and the problems that you have with your alumni, but we feel these are still a very important direction. My comment at this time is that the NCAA Committee on Energy has endorsed this proposal.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): I am very much for the implementation of recruiting rules and restrictions that will try to bring order in that area. I am against making rules which are violated because of the difficulty to maintain them through the policing of the NCAA.

This is a rule that has been attempted again. It has been in practice in a good number of conferences. It has proven to be totally unworkable. I again feel strongly that this is simply putting in the books another rule that will give up vast problems and failure, as well as being done by subterfuge. Unfortunately, I don't think this is the solution to the recruiting area.

Mr. Broyles: I support Mr. Crowder. I would like to speak in opposition to this. We had this in our conference and we could not police it. We had to drop it.

[Proposal No. 96 (page A-50) was defeated by each division by show of paddles.]

Recruiting—Transportation

Hal Lahar (Southwest Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Item No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the adoption of Amendment No. 155.

[The motion was seconded.]

With your permission I would like to comment on No. 155. My comments would also include No. 97, and I will put them together so I don't have to do it more than once. First of all, the amendment to the amendment is editorial. It attempts to clarify and identify the fact that pooling resources for transportation is restricted to that aspect of the use of funds only and not to any other expenditures.

This present legislation was enacted when we had no limitation on the visits to the campus and no limitations on scholarships. At that time this legislation was justified in that it did put some restriction upon moving back and forth between the campus and the home site of the prospect.

In the last three years, the membership, and justifiably so, has established a great number of limitations that have tried to help us approach and attack this problem of costs in athletics. We have limited campus visitations. We have limited the entertainment of prospects at the home site. We have restricted the entertainment on the campus. We have instituted a one-year scholarship. We have limited the number of scholarships that we can award each year.

We have had some institutions legislate and restrict the number of coaches. We have had some institutions who have, of course, eliminated programs altogether. In the present Bylaw 1-2-(c)-O.I. 107, to be exact, it is permissible for an institution through a bona-fide alumni organization to pool resources for purposes of transportation and expenses incidental to visit the campus.

Some of us feel dealing with an alumni in every case is not al-

ways the best way to be involved, but it is something that can take place today legally.

We are in a state of tight economy at this time. I might add the women's programs are facing us, and we are going to be concerned more about costs. It seems to us this is a way of approaching and saving some of our budgets, properly accounted for, so that we try to avoid the violations connected with our recruiting.

It seem to me to be a legitimate way to attack this problem of effecting some economy in our athletic programs.

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): I speak in opposition to this proposal. The proposal serves to interject the representative of athletic interests, the alumni, more forcefully into the recruitment process. Alumni oftentimes are not as knowledgeable about the operating rules and regulations as their institutional representatives.

This serves to provide an advantage to those institutions with great alumni organizations.

It would provide an advantage to those institutions that have alumni with a fleet of private aircraft.

[Proposal No. 155 (page A-76) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 97 (page A-50) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Recruiting—Transportation

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): In behalf of the Pacific-8 Conference, I move the adoption of No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): In behalf of the Council I would like to support this. Actually, at the present time this is interpreted as possible. This O.I. would put in writing what is the interpretation by the Council at the present time. I urge you support this proposition.

Mr. Davis: All this does is provide for something that is in practice and avoid a very embarrassing situation when a parent shows up with the athlete.

[Proposal No. 98 (page A-52) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Tryout Exceptions

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): I move the adoption of Item No. 99, which to amend O.I. 111, following Bylaw 1-3.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to liberalize portions of O.I. 111, to allow a facility to be used for physical activities by a group involving prospective student-athletes, under the very strict control of the Council.

[Proposal No. 99 (page A-52) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Tryout Exceptions

Mr. James: I move the adoption of Item No. 100, which amends O.I. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 100 (page A-52) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

High School All-Star Games

Ernest Casale: (Temple University): In behalf of the Council, I move adoption of 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

This puts in the bylaws that which is in the Constitution.

[Proposal No. 101 (page A-52) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

High School All-Star Games

Mr. Casale: In behalf of the Council, I move No. 102 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

Henry Lowe (University of Missouri): In behalf of the Big Eight Conference, I move Amendment No. 156 to Proposal No. 102 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the operation of the rule and limit it to the coach and other athletic department staff personnel directly involved in the recruitment of the student-athletes.

Mr. Casale: This has received the support of the Council.

John Coyle (Pennsylvania State University): I would also like to support this particular amendment to the amendment and indicate if it is passed we will withdraw our No. 161. Ours is a little bit more specific and applies to physicians and trainers and has specified what should be done.

Delegate: Is a business manager permitted to work with his high school games? We have one in our stadium that has been approved by the NCAA. I want to be sure that our business manager who works with them is permitted to do so.

President Chapman: Yes.

[Proposal No. 156 (page A-77) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 161 (page A-79) was withdrawn.]

[Proposal No. 102 (page A-53) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Rules Committees

Raymond Whispell (Muhlenberg College): In behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 103 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to prevent the establishment of different playing rules for different divisions in any sport. The desirability of this intent is fairly obvious since we have considerable inter-divisional play.

[Proposal No. 103 (page A-53) was approved in all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Television Committee

Captain J. O. Coppedge (U.S. Naval Academy): I move, as a member of the Television Committee which acted on this, the adoption of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

Cecil Coleman (University of Illinois): I move that No. 105 be divided at the end of *NCAA districts* in the bold print.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[The first two sentences of Proposal No. 105 (page A-54) were approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

President Chapman: This is an integrated Bylaw; and if it doesn't pass all three divisions, it doesn't pass any. We now come to the second portion.

Mr. Coleman: I speak in opposition to the second part. I would imagine that the enabling legislation here deals primarily with basketball and in-season basketball because I understand that the Television Committee does not control the National Collegiate Basketball Championship to begin with. That is controlled by the Basketball Committee.

This is basketball and any other sports that might come into it. I would think with the conference television programs we already have in effect, we wouldn't want to endanger those with an NCAA television program coming into the sport of basketball. I urge the membership to vote against that.

Captain Coppedge: It is the opinion of the TV Committee that this central body should be more knowledgeable than other aspects of the NCAA effort and one central body should be the control factor for all television.

Homer Rice (University of North Carolina): As I understand this, this is not to put it in the hands of the Television Committee, and then any committee could be appointed and take over any sport of any television that might be needed at that time.

President Chapman: That is correct.

Mr. Coleman: I understand that any other committee could do it. That certainly does not preclude the possibility of many of the conferences in this country that currently have TV packages in their own sports program not being able to have them in the future.

[The last sentence of Proposal No. 105 (page A-54) was defeated by voice vote.]

Ice Hockey Committee

John McComb (Ohio University): In behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

This simply defines the geographic and divisional requirements for membership on the NCAA Ice Hockey Committee.

[Proposal No. 106 (page A-54) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Legislative Committee

James Hawkins (Fort Valley State College): I move the adoption of No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

This simply brings to the body the fact that the name of this Committee will be changed and that the members of the Committee may be appointed to serve more than two terms.

[Proposal No. 107 (page A-55) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Committees

Raymond Whispell (Muhlenberg College): I move Proposal No. 108 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 108 (page A-55) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Nominating Committee

Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): In behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose is to provide for a mechanism to ensure the membership of the Association has an opportunity to offer nominations for the officers of the Association.

[Proposal No. 109 (page A-56) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Committee on Committees

J. B. Higgins (Lamar University): In behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is self-explanatory. It simply is for the Committee on Committees to conduct a meeting prior to the annual meeting.

[Proposal No. 110 (page A-56) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Ethical Conduct

Franklin Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): I move the adoption of Item No. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

In anticipation of questions, I would say this does not preclude recommending a student for a coaching position or notifying as to the availability of the student-athlete. It does preclude selling the product or marketing the individual's talents.

[Proposal No. 111 (page A-56) was approved by voice vote.]

Advertising

Kenneth Herrick (Texas Christian University): I move consideration of Nos. 113 and 114 before No. 112. If we consider them ahead of No. 112, then No. 112 will become moot if favorable action is received on No. 113 and No. 114.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

H. Evan Zeiger (Samford University): All of us here at this Convention are familiar with the fact that the U. S. Surgeon's Office has advised Americans that alcohol is the number one drug problem in this country now. Our own NCAA Drug Committee and the Association at large has done an outstanding service to our youth and to the entire nation in educating them on the drug and getting information on it.

This proposition offers this Association and the membership the opportunity to eliminate glaring inconsistency of Association advertising in regard to the drug alcohol and begin practicing what we preach. Therefore, I urge a positive vote on this proposal.

Robert Pritchard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): As chairman of the NCAA Drug Education Committee and speaking in behalf of that Committee, I urge you to pass these.

Stan Bates (Western Athletic Conference): Speaking in behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge defeat of this. As you know, we have presently a good basketball and football television program. I think just in the area of those two events our income is about \$2

million. It would be extremely difficult for us to continue the kind of programs we have if we pass this legislation.

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): Speaking in behalf of the Television Committee, I would say what Commissioner Bates said in behalf of the Executive Committee.

[Proposal No. 113 (page A-57) was defeated by show of paddles.]

Resolution: Television Plan

Mr. Herrick: Proposal No. 114 would simply design the implementation of No. 113. I would move the passage of 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 114 (page A-58) was defeated by show of paddles.]

Drug Education Committee

Mr. Herrick: I would like to advocate the NCAA at least present a pilot program on drug education. If we are going to have the drug education tell us of the evil, we should spend as much money telling the youth of America through our broadcasts on television the evils of alcohol, the number one drug problem in the United States.

It is a hypocrisy for this organization to speak out of both sides of its mouth. I move No. 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

Norval Ritchey (University of Oregon): Speaking on behalf of the Committee, I can assure you that the Committee could use a great deal more financial backing to continue the work we are trying to do. We feel we are somewhat successful; but we have been limited by funds, as many Committees of the NCAA are. We would urge you to give us more money so we can do so much more. People do look up to us. Young people look to us; coaches look up to us, and I think we can have a very positive attitude and try to combat what is really the number one drug problem in the country.

Edwin Horner (Baylor University): I would like to place in the record a statement. From reading the newspapers, there are more than 10 million alcoholics. They account for 40 per cent of the problems brought to the family courts and 31 per cent of those who commit suicide. Alcohol abuse accounts for half the murders and half the automobile deaths and injuries in this country each year. After heart disease and cancer, alcoholism is the country's greatest threat to health.

I think we should inform the youth of the problems with alcohol. You are not permitted to smoke in certain seats and have non-smoking sections, but you can have a man next to you as drunk as a hoot owl. I urge our Drug Committee show the evils that I think are apparent to all of us.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): I appreciate the remarks of my good colleagues from the Southwest Conference. I think I have some concern about the impact of the physical affairs of this organization and the planning. I am going to try a motion you may rule out of order. I think this is an important subject and philosophically have support for what they are saying.

I would move this motion and this whole matter, which is of great concern to this Convention, be referred to the Executive Committee and the Council for consideration and to report back to the next Convention with a plan in this area. It is a motion to refer.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 112 (page A-57) was referred to the Council and Executive Committee by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Limitations on Contracts

Jack Doland (McNeese State University): I feel like the problems in No. 115 are national and not just a local. The Round Table showed it was a tremendous one for all of the universities. I feel that Section (a) and Section (b) should be separated from (c) in any vote that is taken. Sections (a) and (b) are for the future and (c) would be retroactive.

I would like to refer this to the Council for further study and to bring it back to the Convention next year. I so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 115 (page A-58) was referred to the Council by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Traditional Fall Season

James Hawkins (Fort Valley State College): In behalf of the Council, I move that No. 116 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to include the last Saturday in August in the definition of the traditional football season and to delete the term *fall*.

[Proposal No. 116 (page A-58) was defeated by each division by show of paddles.]

[Proposals No. 117 and No. 118 (page A-59) were withdrawn.]

Out-of-Season Practice

Harry Troxell (Colorado State University): I move the adoption of No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to specify that the first three days of spring football practice must be limited to non-contact conditioning drills.

Edwin Crowder (University of Colorado): I think most institutions have some form of off-season practice which involves the athlete. I would like to say I don't think it is necessary to just limit it to equipment.

Douglas Weaver (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): I think the coaches are aware of this and there is probably no need for it.

[Proposal No. 119 (page A-60) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Out-of-Season Practice

Mr. Troxell: I move the adoption of No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 120 is to establish additional criteria for out-of-season physical education or physical fitness classes which Coach Crowder just referred to in his previous comments.

Jack Doland (McNeese State University): Subsection (11) in No. 120, I know in our university, would be practically impossible to administer. That would be true at many other schools around the country. There are times we work out in the field house and in an area that is not being used for classes. This is a big problem, weight rooms, running around the track and whatever else you do at that time. I think that particular part would be very hard to administer or hard

to prove. I would like to see (11) withdrawn as part of this whole item. I move to divide No. 120 and make (11) the second part.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

Mr. Weaver: We have a good rule now. We know a football player requires a lot of conditioning, not only in the classroom but outside. I think this particular rule would be a great mistake. Just because there are a few abuses, we should not shoot down all the good points.

[Proposal No. 120 (page A-60) was defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Postseason Football Contests

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): In behalf of Collegiate Commissioners Association, I move No. 121 be adopted.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think this is self-evident. I will note the source of the legislation is the Collegiate Commissioners Association, who, in effect, assigns all the officials to certified postseason bowl games.

Joseph McMullen (Marshall University): I question the use of the word *neutral*. I mean this would infer that officiating crews are not neutral. Do you mean neutrally assigned officiating crews? This word infers something that it should not infer.

[Proposal No. 121 (page A-60) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Permissible Practice

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): I move the adoption of No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

The reason for this measure is because last October 15 was the first permissible day of practice, and according to the existing legislation our picture day fell on Saturday. This was the day of an away football game and all our press were gone, and we didn't have an opportunity to have any press there for picture day on that Saturday.

In discussing this, it seemed more appropriate to allow basketball to have pictures taken for both reasons, for the press and the student.

[Proposal No. 123 (page A-61) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

Division III Championships

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): In behalf of the Executive Committee, I move Proposal No. 124.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Chapman: I think this is an automatic-type thing, because this Convention went on record as trying to get its house in order.

Mr. Steitz: The intent of this is to advance the effective date of the Division III swimming championships from March 1, 1976 to March 1, 1975. The machinery is all set and ready to go, and this would mean that the Division III swimming championships would take place one year earlier than previously indicated.

[Proposal No. 124 (page A-61) was approved by Division III by voice vote.]

Amendments

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): I move the Constitutional

amendment which will permit the remainder of the Bylaws to be adopted, as indicated in No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Chapman: The first part of No. 125 has been moved and seconded. It is pretty obvious. It will take a two-thirds majority.

[Part A of Proposal No. 125 (page A-62) was approved by voice vote.]

Mr. Fuzak: I move the adoption of Part B Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Part B of Proposal No. 125 (page A-62) was approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.]

[Proposal No. 126 (page A-62) was withdrawn.]

Amendments to Amendments

Frank Bowman (California State University, Long Beach): I would like to take just a moment to state our intention here. When we wanted to make some amendments to amendments last year we could not really understand what it meant by increase of the modification of the Constitutional provision. Our only intent is to maybe get a clarification so that the layman who is coming in new to this body will know what to do and will not have the disappointment of saving his amendment to an amendment turned down after it was too late to do anything about it.

I think the Council would maybe like to clarify this. I move to refer No. 127 to the Council for clarification at a later date.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 127 (page A-63) was referred to the Council by voice vote.]

Executive Regulations

President Chapman: We have reached the end of the amendments and will move to the Executive Regulations. They are authorized to be enacted by the Executive Committee in accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws. They stand, when enacted, unless challenged by a subsequent Convention. In this listing, you will note that Nos. 128, 131, 132, 133 and 134 are all Executive Regulations that have been put forward by the Executive Committee and will stand unless challenged. We will not necessarily vote on them.

I would ask on Nos. 128 and 131-134 if there is any challenge of those? If not, they will stand. Seeing no one approaching the microphone, we can say those stand.

We have two Executive Regulations, 129 and 130, which are submitted by members to alter existing regulations; and they are to be considered.

Ineligible Participants

Mr. Bowman: I move the adoption of the Executive Regulation which amends Regulation 2, Section 2-(e), Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent here is that when it is discovered that funds must be returned from an institution and the institution has by policy forwarded those to its conference or allied member, the institution should be relieved from the actual obligation and not have to stand in double jeopardy for that part of the funds that had been turned over to the conference. That is our intent. I guess that you learn by

experience on these things, and that is why we have submitted this amendment.

Edward Steitz (Springfield College): I take a different point of view from the previous speaker. I believe restitution is the issue here. Restitution is not a penalty, and it doesn't mean fine. It speaks to the restitution itself.

As a legal point of view, you can legally have restitution from the state. I submit the restitution that is being talked about here is a separate entity; and when an institution has been given a rebate which it is not legally entitled to, that entire restitution should be received by the Association. I have sympathy for my friend there because he did come before the Executive Committee and appealed his point of view.

I have great sympathy for the fact that the conference in this case did receive some of the funds we feel should have been a restitution back to the NCAA. I think it is analogous to the situation that in the event I received \$4,000 illegally, restitution is in order. I don't have the privilege of keeping \$1,000 for myself and giving \$1,000 to each one of my friends and then I am off the hook. I think this is something that has to be taken into account.

I see an extreme danger. We are trying to resolve a problem for a specific situation that has happened. I see a danger in setting a precedent that we have been operating under in the past.

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Conference): I am still sympathetic with this problem and would support Long Beach.

Mr. Steitz: While I recognize we may have a conference, we do have independents and; what would happen to the independent? If the independent institution was in violation, they will have to return the whole ball of wax. I don't think we should make an exception because it happened to a conference member.

[Proposal No. 129 (page A-65) was defeated by voice vote.]

Championship Eligibility

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): I move the adoption of Proposition No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is our feeling that there are many legitimate athletic programs within our member institutions which primarily, because of expenditures, are not under the direction edict of the department of intercollegiate athletics, and in which many fine student-athletes who are otherwise eligible in all respects for NCAA championship competition are denied the opportunity to compete because of the present regulation. That is why we endorse the approval of this amended Regulation.

Charles Neinas (Big Eight Conference): I understand that an institution can easily certify the eligibility of a student-athlete; but inasmuch as the athletic department has not been responsible for perhaps that athlete arriving at that institution originally, they also are going to go back and investigate the recruiting process even though it may be a club sport and not an intercollegiate sport?

William Dioguardi (Montclair State College): I think this is going to put a hardship on many of the small schools where they are now having problems financing the sports we have. We are already looking to cut back. What you are going to do is to put undue financial

pressure on us to send individuals to something we are not even sponsoring.

[Proposal No. 130 (page A-65) was defeated by voice vote.]

National Collegiate Basketball Championship

President Chapman: We now come to the resolutions. The first one is No. 135. That matter is out of order since you can't have a resolution by divided vote, and besides that the Executive Committee reversed it.

[Proposal No. 135 (page A-68) ruled out of order.]

Resolution: Curtailing Costs

Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): In behalf of the Council, I am pleased to move No. 158. It deals with a special meeting made up of representatives of the Association to consider matters that will hopefully limit costs in intercollegiate athletic programs.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 158 (page A-77) was approved by voice vote.]

Resolution: Postseason Football Games

Robert James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Last year we came before the Convention and supported a deletion of Bylaw 2-2-(j), which placed a limitation on bowl games because we feel it was not enforceable. We did this with the understanding that the bowls would arrive at some meaningful solution to our problem.

They attempted to do it. It didn't work very well. As you all understand, as we told you last year, if it did not we would come forth with a specific proposal. Proposal No. 159 does this. I think it is self-explanatory and I am sure by this time you have had an opportunity to review it. I, therefore, move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

Cliff Speegle (Southwest Athletic Conference): I was at the bowl breakfast, and they unanimously voted to accept this resolution. They will live with the spirit of the resolution.

[Proposal No. 159 (page A-78) was approved by voice vote.]

Resolution: Basketball Hall of Fame

Vannette Johnson (University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff): In behalf of the schools endorsing this resolution, we would like to withdraw it.

C. D. Henry (Big Ten Conference): The black colleges offered this resolution for two reasons. One is because of our concern that no black members are in the Basketball Hall of Fame, but utmost because we cannot get answers to letters to Mr. Lee Williams regarding the criteria for admission to the Hall of Fame.

Since we have been here, members and directors have assured us that we can now obtain this criteria, and in that sense this is why the resolution was withdrawn. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 166 (page A-81) was withdrawn.]

Resolution: Tickets

Al Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I move the adoption of No. 167.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to say the area in which the Southwest Conference is working with regard to recruiting violations and similar violations, is the disposition of complimentary tickets. This is an effort to reduce actual abuses in this very serious situation.

Frank Broyles (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I want to not only ask but to plead to this Convention at this time to give serious consideration to this resolution. For the last 30 days I have been trying to get this as an amendment, and I was out of order. They would let me present this as a resolution.

During these 30 days I have spent a lot of time on the telephone talking to coaches and athletic directors, and I have not seen one that was against this particular resolution because they know—and I know and your athletic directors know—this is the one single area, in my opinion and in their opinions that has the most violations regarding our recruiting rules of any part of the *raging jungle* as Eddie Crowder calls it.

I didn't want any washout here. I don't think it is necessary. There are two areas in this. One is the ticket program downtown where the athlete takes the ticket to and sells them to that individual who then sells them to interested alumni who need good tickets on the 50-yard line. The second area is the coach who looks the other way or gets the alumni to call a hot prospect with the pitch that I need 50-yard line tickets. If you come to a university, I would like to purchase your four tickets to each game for X-number of dollars. It gets astronomical. Now, that youngster, as he visited other institutions, begins to ask the host, while he is showing him around, how much do you get for your tickets? He goes to the next university; and he asks how much do you get for your excess complimentary tickets, and right on down the line.

The coaches I have talked to say they have to look the other way because competition forces them. I am pleading with you and asking you to give the coaches who want to obey the rule, who want to stop this, a chance and pass this resolution which will be in effect for one year. Then it will come before the Convention next year as an amendment.

Mickey Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): Can a resolution of this nature be considered, if passed, legislation for one year?

President Chapman: The resolution would be of a temporary nature, and most of them mention that. This one doesn't. That kind of answers that question. I am advised when Frank submitted it, he did have a one-year date on this and it was not included when they wrote it up.

Charley Scott (University of Alabama): Does that mean this is mandatory on all teams, all universities?

President Chapman: Yes, it does.

[Proposal No. 167 (page A-82) was approved by voice vote.]

William Bell (Fayetteville State University): I have a Resolution which I think everyone present would like to hear.

Whereas, it is generally agreed by most Americans that the National Collegiate Athletic Association is big business, well organized, effectively and efficiently conducted by a professional staff of experts; and

Whereas, the gentleman responsible for the conduct of its affairs at National Conventions goes quietly and unnoticed about effecting the expertly and effectively planned programs; and

Whereas, over a period of 24 years through a staff of men and women whom he has had a keen sense of selection for specific

assignments and through his inspiration of the top athletic leaders of this nation he has helped develop one of the greatest and mature athletic organizations in the world; and

Whereas, Mr. Walter Byers will have served the NCAA 25 years as its executive director by the time of the 1976 Convention, and it has been my privilege to be a part of this great organization during these 25 years, and in recent years working closely with him,

Be It Resolved, that this Convention express its appreciation by joining in a standing vote of applause.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this resolution.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Chapman: I presume by your actions that is evidence of a unanimous approval of that resolution.

17. BOSTON UNIVERSITY APPEAL

President Chapman: You will recall the ultimate authority in the internal processes of the NCAA is an appeal to the Convention. When such an appeal is made, we bring it to you. Boston University had an eligibility matter that was ruled on by the Eligibility Committee and the Council, and it is now pressing for an appeal here. Boston University will present its side. Then our Eligibility Committee will present its side. We are asking them to limit themselves to 10 minutes.

Richard Gibney (Boston University): I know it comes at a very bad time, but I would like to appeal to the Council and go to the floor in the case of Peter Marzo, Boston University hockey player, who recently received a lifetime suspension from playing hockey. We feel this is very important, and it has been an injustice. At this time we request you to override the Council's decision.

This is a matter which has been before the Council for more than one year. We appeal for reinstatement of eligibility. We have appeared before the Committee and also before the Council.

There is no question but Peter Marzo, a hockey player from Boston University, violated O.I. 4 and O.I. 5. If you would like specifics, I certainly can give them to you; but I don't want to drag this thing out. I will say in general terms that he did sign a contract, he received payments for participation in major junior league hockey in Canada. As I said earlier, he clearly was in violation of O.I. 4 and O.I. 5. But he is like 100 other Canadian boys who have violated O.I. 4 and O.I. 5. They violated these rules as a result of a difference between the system in the United States and the one in Canada.

Because of the Council's recognition of the difference between our systems, it appointed a subcommittee to hear these appeals. More than 100 boys from 29 schools made appeals and because of the subcommittee and the Council recognized that the Canadian system boys were not at fault, it reinstated most of the boys that made appeals. In a few instances it gave five-game suspensions to some boys, and then reinstated them. There were only two boys turned down legally.

In effect, Peter was one of the two that was given a lifetime suspension when everyone else received five-game suspensions. Again, I would like to reiterate that we feel that he was in violation of these rules, but he should be treated the same as the other 98 boys. He played under the same Canadian rules and received the same kind of payments.

I am sure the Council will say he was the worse case of all. We will not disagree with that. Even if they do, there is still a lot of latitude between a five-game suspension and a lifetime suspension. I think we have to recognize there are tremendous differences between the two systems in the United States and Canada.

He now is enrolled in Boston University and with the lifetime suspension he is not able to continue with his athletic career. We feel that he should be penalized, but should be treated like everyone else was in this situation. We believe that the action to ban him for life is very harsh. We ask this Convention to overturn the Council's determination and impose some lesser penalty.

Stanley Marshall (South Dakota State University and NCAA Council): The Eligibility Subcommittee was made up of Louis Myers, University of Arizona; Walter Hass, University of Chicago, and myself, with the Association's legal counsel in attendance, with a staff of assistants. We met in Chicago for two days. We attempted to handle individually something over 100 appeals. It became quite obvious that a large number fell in the area or category that could qualify on a one-type application for relief. It was our intent and our hope to deal as fairly as possible with each individual involved.

In the case cited, however, the young man received well beyond, in terms of type and amount of financial assistance, beyond the rest. To cite you examples, in 1970-71, he received an amount of cash, \$423, which was in no way educationally related. There were no strings attached, and they were used to purchase a car. In 1971-72, he received a retroactive payment of \$10 per week; also a payment of \$5 per week. Also in 1971-72, he received a specific incentive payment. The coach contributed \$35 to a fund for each goal scored by his team and subtracted \$30 for each goal scored by the opposing team. I cite these instances and draw your attention to the fact there was a very marked difference in one of the cases that we handled.

The young man was not suspended for a lifetime. He is ineligible for a two-year period at his institution. In summary, the Subcommittee on Eligibility was dealing with a special set of circumstances and was attempting to restore eligibility where possible, while at the same time preserving the basic amateur principles of your Association.

In the case of this student-athlete, there was no rationale by which the Committee could grant an appeal and at the same time preserve any meaningful distinction between amateur and professional. I strongly urge that this appeal be denied.

[The appeal was defeated by voice vote.]

18. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

James Higgins (Lamar University): In behalf of the representatives who have served as members of the 1975 Committee on Committees, I would first like to express appreciation for the opportunity to serve the Association. Secondly, to extend our thanks to Ms. Fannie Vaughan for the invaluable assistance in Committee's work.

Please refer to the Committee Report which has been circulated to you. The nominees shown in the Report are hereby presented to this Convention for election of the Committees for the terms indicated. I move acceptance of the Committee's nominees.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

19. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): In behalf of the Nominating Committee, I am pleased to present the following slate:

For President—

John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University

For Secretary-Treasurer—

Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University

For Vice-President, District 2—

Raymond Whispell, Muhlenberg College

For Vice-President, District 4—

Edwin Saxer, University of Toledo

For Vice-President, District 5—

James Frank, Lincoln (Missouri) University

For Vice-President, District 6—

J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin

For Vice-President, District 8—

Edward Betz, University of the Pacific

For Vice-President-at-Large—

Ernest Casale, Temple University

For Vice-President-at-Large—

John Winkin, University of Maine, Orono

For Vice-President-at-Large—

Robert Strimer, Ohio Wesleyan University

For Vice-President-at-Large—

Hubert Heitman, University of California, Davis

For Vice-President-at-Large

John Eiler, East Stroudsburg State College

I move the election of this slate.

[The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

President John Fuzak: I realize it has been a very difficult and long day. I do appreciate this opportunity to serve the organization. It is a very serious responsibility and also, of course, a great opportunity. All I can do is to promise you to give my very best efforts to conducting the affairs of the Association in at least a similar manner as they way they have been conducted in the last two years. Thank you again. [Applause]

I would like very much to make this presentation to our outgoing President. I can only hope that the members of the Council and I can carry on and to some extent imitate the insight and judgment shown by Alan Chapman as well as the patience, humor, impartiality and integrity he has shown over these two years.

Alan, I just hope my term in office will be as successful as yours.

[The assembly extended Past President Chapman a prolonged standing ovation.]

Past President Chapman: Thank you very much. I have never had a more rewarding experience. The part I liked best about athletics is where you meet the finest people. Thank you.

President Fuzak: At this time I would like to call upon Secretary-Treasurer Stanley Marshall to come up. [Applause]

It will be a pleasure to work with Stanley. I will give him a lot of work and I imagine he will give me some. Stanley has a presentation to make to our outgoing Secretary-Treasurer.

Secretary-Treasurer Marshall: This gentleman has served in many capacities for many years and most recently as our Secretary-Treasurer, a gentleman who has stood for everything that is good in our Association, Dick Koenig. I present him with this memento of our appreciation. [Applause]

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): I will do the same thing I have done the last two years. Everything Al said, I agreed with it. It has been a real pleasure to serve you. I know from the warmth of your applause to Alan what a great guy he is. I have had a chance to work a lot closer with him than you have, and it has been a real privilege. It has also been a privilege to work with Walter and his fine staff. I thank you very much for the opportunity. [Applause]

President Fuzak: Just one more item. I would like for the Association to acknowledge the fine efforts of our outgoing members of the Council. Will the outgoing members of the Council please rise?

[The Delegates assembled gave a standing ovation to the outgoing members of the Council.]

If there is no further business to come before the Association, at this time, we are duly adjourned.

[The Convention adjourned at 6 p.m.]

Appendix A

69th ANNUAL CONVENTION

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws shall become effective August 1, 1975, unless otherwise indicated. Convention action on Official Interpretations shall be effective immediately unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1974-75 NCAA Manual.]

NO. 1 AMATEURISM—SCHOLARSHIPS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(3), page 6, as follows:

"(3) He has directly or indirectly used his athletic skill for pay in any form in that sport; however, a student-athlete may accept or have accepted scholarships or educational grants-in-aid *from administered* by his educational institution which do not conflict with the governing legislation of this Association."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Professional Rulings).

Intent: To confirm the existing interpretation that a student's acceptance of scholarships and educational grants-in-aid administered by his educational institution does not jeopardize his eligibility at NCAA member institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 2 AMATEURISM—DEFINITION OF PAY

Constitution: Amend O.I. 1, following Constitution 3-1-(a)-(3), page 6, by adding a new paragraph (b), as follows:

"(b) The term 'pay' specifically includes, but is not limited to, receipt directly or indirectly of any salary, gratuity or comparable compensation, division or split of surplus, educational expenses not permitted by governing legislation of this Association, and excessive or improper expenses, awards and benefits. Expenses received from an outside amateur sports team or organization in excess of actual and necessary travel and meal expenses for practice and game competition shall be considered pay."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Professional Rulings).

Intent: To more clearly define pay in accordance with current Association practice and to specify that a student-athlete may receive from an outside amateur sports team or organization certain actual and necessary expenses related to practice and game competition.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 3 AMATEURISM—EMPLOYMENT BY PROFESSIONALS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(b), page 6, as follows:

"(b) Any student-athlete who signs or who has ever signed a contract or commitment of any kind to play professional athletics in a sport, regardless of its legal enforceability or the consideration (if any) received; plays or has ever played on any professional athletic team in a sport, or receives or has ever received, directly or indirectly, a salary, reimbursement of expenses or any other form of financial assistance from a professional organization in a sport for any purpose whatsoever based upon his athletic skill or participation, except as permitted by the governing legislation of this Association, no longer shall be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in that sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Professional Rulings).

Intent: To specify that the prohibition against employment by professional sports organizations shall apply only when the individual's athletic skill or participation is a factor.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 4 AMATEURISM—PROFESSIONAL TEAM DEFINITION

Constitution: Amend O.I. 4, following Constitution 3-1-(d), page 7, as follows:

"O.I. 4. (a) A professional team shall be any organized team (i) which is a member of or affiliated with a recognized professional sports organization; or any organized team (ii) which is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization; (iii) which is a member of a playing league that is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization, or (iv) on which there is an athlete receiving directly or indirectly payment of any kind (other than actual and necessary expenses for game trips) from a professional team or professional sports organization for his participation.

"(b) An amateur team or playing league which receives financial support from a national amateur sports administrative organization or an administrative equivalent, which receives developmental funds from a professional team or professional sports organization, shall not be considered a professional team or league.

"(b) (c) Student-athletes may compete on tennis or golf teams with individuals who are competing for cash or comparable prize, provided the student does not receive payment of any kind for his participation."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Professional Rulings).

Intent: To alter the present definition of a professional team and to permit the receipt, under specified conditions, of developmental funds from a professional organization.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 5 AMATEURISM—ICE HOCKEY

Constitution: Delete O.I. 5 and O.I. 6, following Constitution 3-1-(d), page 7, as follows:

"O. I. 5. A student-athlete may have played ice hockey on a team in a foreign country prior to his matriculation at a member institution, provided that any student-athlete who has been a member of any ice hockey team in a foreign country shall be ineligible if he has received, directly or indirectly, from a hockey team any salary, division or split of surplus, educational expenses, or has received payment for any expenses in excess of actual and necessary travel expenses on team trips, a reasonable allowance for one meal for each practice and home game and actual and necessary travel expenses to practice and home games. No student-athlete shall represent his institution in ice hockey unless there is on file in the office of the director of athletics an affidavit in form prescribed by this Association signed by the student-athlete stating his compliance with this provision. (The prescribed affidavit form is printed on pages 29-30.)

"O.I. 6. Any student-athlete who has participated as a member of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association's major junior A hockey classification shall not be eligible for intercollegiate hockey."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Foreign Athletic Recruitment, Special Committee on Professional Rulings).

Intent: To eliminate from NCAA legislation these specialized interpretations regarding the sport of ice hockey so the Association's amateur rulings apply equally to aliens and USA citizens.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 6 AMATEURISM—PROFESSIONAL TEAM DEFINITION

Constitution: Amend O.I. 4, following Constitution 3-1-(d), page 7, by adding new paragraphs (c) and (d), as follows:

"(c) Hockey teams classified by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association as major junior A are professional teams.

"(d) Hockey teams otherwise classified by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association shall not be considered professional teams."

Source: Boston University.

Intent: To specify the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association teams that are to be considered as professional teams in the application of NCAA legislation.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 7 AMATEURISM—ICE HOCKEY

Constitution: Amend O.I. 5, following Constitution 3-1-(d), page 7, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

"O.I. 5. A student-athlete who has played on any organized ice hockey team shall be ineligible if he has received, directly or indirectly, from that hockey team any salary, division or split of surplus or if he has received payment for any expenses in excess of actual and necessary travel expenses on team trips, a reasonable allowance for one meal for each practice and home game and actual and necessary travel expenses to practice and home games. If a player lives away from his parents' home, payments made by the hockey team directly to the player's landlord for reasonable room and board expenses not in excess of \$30 per week shall not render the player ineligible. If a player lives away from his home school district, tuition payments made by the hockey team directly to local school authorities on behalf of the player shall not render the player ineligible. No student-athlete shall represent his institution in ice hockey unless his director of athletics has filed with this Association a complete affidavit in the form prescribed by the Association indicating the student-athlete's compliance with this provision."

Source: Boston University.

Intent: To clarify permissible expenses a student-athlete may receive in the sport of ice hockey.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 8 AMATEURISM—CAHA PARTICIPATION

Constitution: Amend O.I. 6, following Constitution 3-1-(d), page 7, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

"O.I. 6. Any student-athlete who has dressed for or played in any exhibition or regular-season game for any team classified by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association as major junior A shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics. Any student-athlete who has attended a tryout camp for any team classified by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association as major junior A shall be ineligible if he received any direct or indirect payment other than reasonable room and board expenses not in excess of \$30 per week during his attendance at the tryout camp."

Source: Boston University.

Intent: To define "participation" in the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association's major junior A classification and to specify expenses that may be received by a player attending a tryout camp for a team in that classification.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 9 AMATEURISM—SUMMER EXPENSES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(3), page 9, as follows:

"(3) Payment of excessive or improper expense allowances, including, but not limited to, payment of (i) money to team

members or individual competitors for unspecified or unitemized expenses; (ii) expenses incurred by a student-athlete which are prohibited by the rules governing an amateur non-college event in which the student-athlete participates, or (iii) expenses incurred by a student-athlete competing in an event which occurs at a time when he is not regularly enrolled in a full-time program of studies during the regular academic year, or not eligible to represent his institution, except that expenses may be paid for a student-athlete to compete in regularly scheduled intercollegiate events and established national championships occurring between terms, provided he is representing his institution and was eligible for intercollegiate competition the preceding term, and in international competition approved by the NCAA Council."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To preclude payment of expenses for participation during summer months, except as expressly permitted.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 162) by show of paddles.

NO. 10 COMPLIMENTARY TICKETS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(4), page 9, as follows:

"(4) Award of Awarding complimentary tickets in excess of four per student-athlete per contest, and awarding complimentary tickets to student-athletes in sports other than those in which the student-athlete is a participant. It is not permissible for an institution to repurchase the complimentary tickets awarded to its student-athletes, provided they are purchased for no more than the published price per ticket."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To restrict the awarding of complimentary tickets to student-athletes to the sport(s) in which the student-athlete participates; and to allow the institution, if it elects to do so, to repurchase tickets to avoid problems in the use or disposal of such tickets.

Action: Motion to consider first sentence and second sentence separately approved by voice vote. First sentence approved by show of paddles. Second sentence defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 11 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(1), page 10, as follows:

"(1) Actual and necessary expenses on intercollegiate athletic trips (including reasonable trips to practice sites other than those of the institution), or to transport a team a reasonable distance (approximately one hundred miles) to an off-campus site for a postseason team award or recognition meeting, or the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the wife of a student-athlete in accompanying him to a certified postseason football game or an NCAA championship in the sport of football in which the student-athlete is certified eligible to participate."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To authorize institutional payment of expenses of a student-athlete's wife to attend a certified postseason football game or an NCAA football championship in which her husband is eligible to compete.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 137) by show of paddles.

NO. 12 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (o), page 42, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"(o) A competing institution may include as a part of its official party to attend a certified postseason football game the spouses of players on the travelling squad for the particular postseason football contest, and the institution may pay the necessary travelling, lodging and meal costs for the spouses of such players."

Source: Big Eight Conference, Big Ten Conference, Pacific-8 Conference, Southeastern Conference, Southwest Athletic Conference, Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To affirm the present practice of underwriting by a member institution the expenses of players' wives to attend football bowl games:

Action: Division I only: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 13 PERMISSIBLE AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(7)-(ii), page 10, as follows:

"(ii) Awards for special events such as postseason football games, NCAA meets and tournaments and featured individual competition may be presented only by the management of such an event and an institution which has had or will have a team participate in such event. All awards must be properly personalized. Multiple awards are permissible for special events, but the value of any and all awards received by any one competitor may not exceed \$100 \$200."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To increase the dollar limitation on the specified type of awards from \$100 to \$200.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 14 ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS

Bylaws: Amend Article 6 by adding a new Section 6, page 63, as follows:

"Section 6. Individual Certification of Compliance. In addition to meeting the eligibility requirements specified in Bylaw 4-1, all participants in a National Collegiate Athletic Association championship must sign an affidavit certifying compliance with the amateur standing provisions of Constitution 3-1. This requirement shall be administered by the chairman of the games committee, and all affidavits shall be taken on a form prescribed by the NCAA Executive Committee."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To require all student-athletes who are to participate in NCAA championships to attest in affidavit form to their amateur standing.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 138) by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 15 ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, by adding a new paragraph (j), page 52, as follows:

"(j) He must, if requested by the Executive Committee, sign an affidavit certifying his amateur standing under the provisions of Constitution 3-1.

"[Note: If the Executive Committee requires an individual entered in an NCAA championship to sign an affidavit attesting to his amateur status, such affidavit shall be administered by the chairman of the games committee and shall be taken on a form prescribed by the Executive Committee.]"

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To authorize the NCAA Executive Committee, if necessary, to require a student-athlete to sign an affidavit to verify his eligibility to compete in an NCAA championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 16 OUTSIDE COMPETITION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(d), page 18, as follows:

"(d) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in his sport for the duration of the season if, following his enrollment in college and during any year in which he is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he competes or has competed as a member of any outside team in any non-collegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) in his sport during his institution's intercollegiate season. The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or to participate in other international competition involving the national teams of the nations represented. The intercollegiate season in a sport shall be the period of time between opening of the institution's formal varsity practice and its last regularly scheduled game."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who practiced and tried out for a team and was thereafter dropped from the squad, or who voluntarily withdraws from the squad, or who has officially withdrawn from his institution, or who has withdrawn from the squad for similar reasons, to have the opportunity to participate on outside amateur teams in his sport with the understanding that he forfeits his eligibility for intercollegiate competition in

that sport for the duration of that season; further, to specify that the student-athlete whose institution's season has started while he is participating in outside competition in his sport is ineligible to become a member of his institution's squad or team in that sport during that season.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 17 OUTSIDE PARTICIPATION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(d), page 18, as follows:

"(d) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in his sport for one year if, following his enrollment in college and during any year in which he is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, he competes as a member of any outside team in his sport during his institution's intercollegiate season. The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or to participate in other international competition involving the national teams of the nations represented. The intercollegiate season in a sport football shall be the period of time between opening of the institution's formal varsity practice from and including the second regularly scheduled game through its last regularly scheduled game or postseason NCAA-approved competition, and in other sports the period of time from and including the fourth regularly scheduled game or contest through its last regularly scheduled game or contest or postseason NCAA-approved competition."

Source: University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.

Intent: To specify the penalty for outside competition as the loss of one year of eligibility in that sport and to redefine the "intercollegiate season" in football and other sports for the purposes of this provision.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 18 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Constitution: Amend O.I. 15, following Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 13 as follows:

"O.I. 15. The phrases 'good academic standing' and 'satisfactory progress' are to be interpreted at each member institution by the academic authorities who determine the meaning of such phrases for all students, subject to the controlling legislation by the conference or similar association of which the institution is a member.

"(a) At a minimum, 'satisfactory progress' shall require a student-athlete to complete satisfactorily a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit, or in the case of an institution which awards academic credit on a system other than a semester or quarter basis, complete at least a minimum of 20 per cent of the academic units required for a baccalaureate degree, at the member institution prior to the beginning of the academic year (fall term) in which he competes. Such hours must be completed after the start of the fall term for the previous academic year in which he was in regular attendance.

"(b) Credits earned in summer school, night school and/or extension courses which are accepted by the member institution in which the student-athlete is enrolled may be counted in fulfillment of the credit hour or unit requirement provided these credits are satisfactorily completed during the twelve calendar months preceding the fall term of the academic year in question."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify a minimum academic eligibility requirement for satisfactory progress toward a degree.

Effective Date: August 1, 1975.

Action: Defeated by show of paddles (also see No. 139).

NO. 19 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Constitution: Amend O.I. 15, following Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 13, as follows:

"O.I. 15. The phrases 'good academic standing' and 'satisfactory progress' are to be interpreted at each member institution by the academic authorities who determine the meaning of such phrases for all students, subject to the controlling legislation by the conference or similar association of which the institution is a member.

"(a) Each member institution shall require a student-athlete, as a condition of eligibility to compete, to progress toward graduation, subsequent to initial attendance in the member institution, by (1) earning at least 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of degree credit work during the immediately preceding 12 calendar months, and (2) accumulating at least an average of 12 units of degree credit work for each academic period of the regular academic year (excluding summer periods) subsequent to initial attendance in the member institution; or, in the case of an institution which awards academic credits on a system other than a semester or quarter basis, the institution shall require the student-athlete to progress by (3) earning at least 80 per cent of the degree credit work of the normal full-time yearly load during the immediately preceding 12 calendar months, and (4) accumulating at least an average of 80 per cent of the degree credit work of the normal full-time load for each academic period of the regular academic year (excluding summer periods) subsequent to initial attendance in the member institution.

"(b) The initial calculation shall be made as of the beginning of the autumn academic period next subsequent to initial attendance, and thereafter the calculation shall be made as of the beginning of each subsequent autumn academic period. The calculation shall pro-rate progress at 12 units per academic period of attendance during the initial, regular academic year (excluding summer periods) for students entering at the beginning of the second semester or second or third quarter; or in an institution not on a semester or quarter basis, pro-rating shall be on the basis of 80 per cent of the normal full-time load for a student-athlete entering otherwise than at the beginning of the normal academic year.

"(c) The award of credit after the commencement of the autumn academic period, by reason of removal of an incomplete previously received, may be used to recalculate progress by applying such credit to the academic period of enrollment in the course, or the award of credit may be applied to the academic period in which the incomplete was removed.

"(d) Correspondence credit shall be applied to the academic period in which the credit is entered by the registrar; except if the study was commenced before the beginning of that period, credit may be applied either to that period or as of the beginning of that period.

"(e) The annual 24 semester hour, 36 quarter hour or 80 per cent of normal full-time load requirement shall be reduced on a pro rata basis when normal progress during the regular academic year is prevented by military service. Academic periods in which normal progress is prevented by military service shall not be used to calculate the accumulated average progress.

"(f) A student-athlete who, after initial attendance at a member institution, does not meet the requirements of the progress rules by reason of absence from school (either the member or other collegiate institution) during the regular academic year, may be nonetheless eligible for competition if adequate progress is shown by calculation made as of the beginning of the academic period of renewed attendance in the member institution, excluding the academic periods of absence, and the following conditions have been met:

"(1) The absence from school was caused by verifiable personal reasons and not motivated by intention to circumvent the purposes of the progress rules;

"(2) During the absence from school, the student-athlete did not engage in such outside competition as would have caused ineligibility during enrollment;

"(3) The student-athlete was eligible for enrollment during the absence from school;

"(4) The student-athlete has otherwise satisfied the progress requirements in the last two semesters or three quarters of enrollment during regular academic years, and

"(5) A petition for eligibility is approved by the conference of which the institution is a member or, in the case of independent institutions, by a committee designated by the NCAA Council."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To specify a minimum academic eligibility requirement for satisfactory progress toward a degree, and to set forth permissible exceptions to that requirement.

Effective Date: August 1, 1975.

Action: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 20 ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 13, as follows:

"(c) He is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as determined by the regula-

tions of that institution, except that a student-athlete who has received his baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution he attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided he has athletic eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within four five years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To permit students who have completed requirements for baccalaureate or equivalent degrees to utilize any remaining eligibility during the five-year eligibility period established by Constitution 3-9-(a), provided that eligibility is utilized at the institution where the student-athlete studied and competed as an undergraduate.

Action: Defeated 200-192 (two-thirds required for approval).

NO. 21 2.000 RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), pages 55-56, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to Division II members.]

"(b) A Division I or Division II member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate programs:"

[Paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To apply the provisions of the 2.000 rule to members of Division II.

Action: Division II only: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 22 2.000 RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), pages 55-56, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to Division III members.]

"(b) A Division I or Division III member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate programs:"

[Paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To apply the provisions of the 2.000 rule to members of Division III.

Action: Division III only: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 23 2.000 RULE

Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 409, following Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(1), page 55, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"O.I. 409. If a student reports for practice or competition before his high school grade point average has been certified, he may practice, but not compete, for a maximum of two weeks. After this two-week period, the student must have an established minimum high school grade point average of 2.000 to continue practicing or to compete."

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To enable a student to practice, but not compete, for a period not to exceed two weeks while awaiting certification of his 2.000 high school grade point average.

Action: Division I only: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 24 CONVERSION TO 4.000

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), pages 55-56, by adding a new paragraph (4), as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(4) If a student was not recruited as defined in O.I. 100, and if the high school or preparatory school attended by the student-athlete did not employ the conventional grading scale based on a maximum of 4.000, Division I member institutions may calculate an equivalent grade point average on the 4.000 scale by using appropriate conversion factors. The faculty athletic representative shall maintain a record of the conversion factors employed in each case. If, however, the student-athlete was recruited per O.I. 100, the high school or preparatory school must supply the grade point average converted to the 4.000 scale."

Source: Stanford University.

Intent: To provide a procedure in certain cases for eliminating the difficulties caused by widespread use by high schools and preparatory schools of grading scales other than the standard 4.000 scale.

Action: Division I only: Defeated, 71-109 (also see No. 140).

NO. 25 CONVERSION TO 4.000

Bylaws: The following interpretation relating to Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(1), page 55, appears as Case No. 188, page 246, 1974-75 NCAA Manual. The member indicated has asked that it be reviewed by the 69th annual Convention:

"Situation: To establish eligibility under Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(1) [2.000 rule], a high school or preparatory school must provide a student's grade point average. A high school or preparatory school grades on a system other than the 4.000 scale (e.g., a 3.000 or 5.000 scale, or a percentage scale of 100). (224)

"Question: May an NCAA member institution convert the student's grade point average provided by the high school or preparatory school to the 4.000 scale for purposes of determining eligibility?

"Answer: No. The high school or preparatory school must provide a student's grade point average including any necessary conversion to the 4.000 scale which is defined by the NCAA as

follows: 4.000=Excellent (A); 3.000=Good or Above Average (B); 2.000=Average (C); 1.000=Below Average (D); 0.000=Falling (F).

"The grade point average submitted to the member institution must be recorded on his official high school transcript or other official written statement sent directly by the school to the admissions office of the NCAA member institution. This certification must represent the student's accumulative grade point average for all work taken through the sixth, seventh or eighth semester.

"If the school will not provide a converted grade point average to the 4.000 scale or certify the student's grade point average, the student is considered a non-qualifier for the purpose of establishing his eligibility under the 2.000 rule. [Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(1)]"

Appellant: Mid-American Conference. Appellant proposes answer be changed from "no" to "yes" and that the college admissions officer or registrar be permitted to convert a grade point average to the 4.000 scale if the high school or preparatory school will not do so.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 140 (also see No. 141).

NO. 26 TRANSFER RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 49, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"(d) He must, after transfer from another four-year collegiate institution, have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution, except that these provisions shall not apply to students transferring between Division III member institutions or to Division III institutions, and provided the student had not been the recipient of financial aid based in any degree upon his athletic ability, as certified by the financial aids office of the institution from which the student transferred."

Source: Fredonia State University College, University of Rochester.

Intent: To exempt Division III member institutions from the provisions of Bylaw 4-1-(d) under the conditions specified.

Action: Division III only: Defeated as amended (see No. 142) by show of paddles.

NO. 27 TRANSFERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d)-(1), page 49, as follows:

"(1) A student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at any four-year college must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution, unless he has completed a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours at the junior college following his transfer from the four-year college, and also has graduated from the junior college, and one calendar year must have

elapsed since his transfer from the first four-year college, or is readmitted to the four-year college first attended."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Eight Conference, Big Ten Conference, Mid-American Conference, Missouri Valley Conference, Southern Conference, Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To prohibit a transfer from a four-year institution from attending and graduating from a junior college and becoming immediately eligible at another four-year institution unless at least one calendar year has elapsed since his transfer from the initial four-year institution.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 28 TRANSFER RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d)-(1), page 49, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

"(1) A student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at any four-year college must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution, except this provision shall not apply if:

"(i) He is readmitted to the four-year college first attended; or

"(ii) He has completed a minimum of 24 semester hours or a minimum of 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit from the junior college and of credit at the certifying institution following his transfer from the four-year college, with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.000, and has spent at least one academic year (two semesters or three quarters) in residence at the junior college and the certifying institution, excluding summer sessions; or

"(iii) He has graduated from the junior college and has completed one calendar year of residence (two semesters or three quarters) at the junior college and the certifying institution after attendance at the four-year college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: Far Western Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at a four-year college to combine the credit hours earned and residence completed at the junior college and at the certifying institution in realizing the 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours required for eligibility.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 29 ALIEN STUDENT-ATHLETE

Bylaws: Delete Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(2), page 50, and renumber subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(2) Participation as an individual or as a representative of any team whatever in a foreign country by an alien student-athlete in each twelve-month period after his nineteenth birthday and prior to his matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To eliminate from NCAA legislation a provision which is currently inoperative by court order.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions: Division II, 48-54; Division III, 50-55; Division I, 39-145.

NO. 30 TRANSFERS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 402, following Bylaw 4-1-(i), pages 51-52, as follows:

"O.I. 402. A student shall not be considered a transfer:

[Paragraphs (a) through (h) remain unchanged.]

"(i) In a particular sport if, subsequent to his initial attendance at a collegiate institution, he transfers from a four-year collegiate institution after having neither practiced nor participated in that particular sport, on the intercollegiate level, for a consecutive two-year period immediately prior to his transfer."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To waive the residence requirements of the transfer rule for a transfer student from a four-year college if that student had not participated (practice or competition) in his particular sport on the intercollegiate level during the two years immediately prior to the transfer.

Action: Approved by Division III by show of paddles; defeated by Division I by show of paddles; defeated by Division II by show of paddles. Motion to reconsider in Division III defeated by voice vote.

NO. 31 TRANSFERS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 402, following Bylaw 4-1-(i), pages 51-52, as follows:

"O.I. 402. A student shall not be considered a transfer:

[Paragraphs (a) through (g) remain unchanged.]

"(h) If the NCAA Eligibility Committee concludes that he changed institutions in order to continue participation in his sport because (1) his original four-year collegiate institution dropped the sport from its intercollegiate program, or (2) his original four-year collegiate institution never sponsored his sport on the intercollegiate level while he was in attendance at that institution, provided he had never attended any other collegiate institution which offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To waive the residence requirements of the transfer rule under the described conditions.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 32 TRANSFERS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 402, following Bylaw 4-1-(i), pages 51-52, by deleting paragraphs (c), (d) and (e), substituting a new paragraph (c) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"O.I. 402. A student shall not be considered a transfer:

[Paragraphs (a) and (b) remain unchanged.]

"(c) Upon return to his original institution after participation in a cooperative educational exchange program, provided he is to receive his baccalaureate degree from the institution from which he transferred to participate in the exchange program;

"(d) Upon return to his original institution after attendance of one semester or quarter at another institution for purposes of taking academic courses not available at his original institution;

"(e) Upon return to his original institution after attendance of one academic year at another collegiate institution in accordance with the program recommended by the appropriate academic officer at the original institution, provided he was in good academic standing at the time he left the original institution;

"(c) In a particular sport, in the instance of a student who:

"(1) Enrolls at a second collegiate institution, and

"(2) Does not practice or participate in the particular sport at the second institution, and

"(3) Returns to the original institution."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To waive the residence requirements of the transfer rule in a particular sport for a transfer student who returns to his original institution after attendance at another collegiate institution for any reason whatsoever, provided the student did not practice or compete in that particular sport during his residence at the second institution.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 143) by all three divisions by single voice vote and then by each division by voice vote. Later motion to reconsider defeated by Division III, show of paddles; approved by Division I, show of paddles; approved by Division II, show of paddles. Reconsideration, defeated by Division II, show of paddles; defeated by Division I, show of paddles.

NO. 33 TRANSFER RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 49, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division III.]

"(d) He must, after transfer from another four-year collegiate institution, have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters semester and one calendar year eighteen weeks must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution."

Source: North Carolina Wesleyan College.

Intent: To shorten the transfer residence requirement for Division III institutions.

Action: Opened to vote by all three divisions. Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 34 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, page 49, as follows:

"Section 1. Individual Eligibility. Any participant in a Na-

tional Collegiate Athletic Association championship who represents an NCAA member in outside competition must be certified by his institution as satisfying all of the following requirements for eligibility."

Source: South Atlantic Conference.

Intent: To apply NCAA individual eligibility rules to all participants who represent institutions in intercollegiate and other outside events, requiring all member institutions to conform to a minimum standard for individual eligibility.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 35 ELIGIBILITY RULES

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, pages 49-56.

A. Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), pages 55-56, by eliminating the present language and substituting the following:

"(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament or to appear on an NCAA television program unless the institution conducts all its intercollegiate programs in conformance with the provisions of Bylaw 4-1."

B. Amend Article 4, Section 1, pages 49-53, by eliminating the present language and substituting the following:

"Section 1. Individual Eligibility. A participant in a National Collegiate Athletic Association championship must satisfy all of the following requirements:

"(a) He must be eligible under the rules of his institution as well as the rules of the intercollegiate athletic conference of which his institution is a member, if such affiliation is held.

"(b) He must be eligible to represent his institution in intercollegiate athletic competition under all of the applicable provisions of the Constitution and Bylaws.

"(c) He must, at the time of competition, be registered for at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by his institution, which, in any event, shall not be less than 12 semester hours or 12 quarter hours; or, if the competition takes place between terms, he must have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition.

"(d) He must not have engaged in three previous seasons of varsity competition after his freshman year.

"(1) Any participation during a season in an intercollegiate sport, regardless of time, shall be counted as a season of competition in that sport. Indoor and outdoor track and field shall be considered separate sports.

"(2) A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by his conference or his institution for reasons of 'hardship,' which is defined as that incapacity resulting from injury or illness under the following conditions:

"(i) It occurs in a varsity season beyond the freshman year, and

"(ii) It prevents him from participating in more than one football game or more than three contests in any other sport, provided the incapacity occurred in the first half of the season.

"[Note: This provision shall be administered by the allied conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee.]

"(3) Participation as an individual or as a representative of any team whatever in a foreign country by an alien student-athlete in each twelve-month period after his nineteenth birthday and prior to his matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition.

"[Note: This provision has been suspended by court decision, which is subject to appeal.]

"(4) Freshmen are eligible for varsity competition in all sports. Participation by a freshman on the varsity team of a junior college shall be counted as one of the four permissible seasons of varsity competition.

"(5) Competition by a student-athlete representing his institution in international competition during the summer vacation period shall not affect his seasons of eligibility, provided that the competition has been approved by the Department of State and sanctioned by the NCAA Council, it being understood that request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to the competition.

"(6) Any team which engages in outside competition and includes a sophomore, junior, senior, or a student who, although academically classified as a freshman, has been in college residence two semesters or three quarters, shall be considered to be of varsity status.

"(e) If his eligibility changes at the end of a quarter or semester, he shall become eligible or ineligible to compete in an NCAA championship on the first day of classes of the following semester or quarter, except that if he is eligible to compete at the time of his or his institution's first participation in an NCAA championship, he shall remain eligible for the remainder of the meet or tournament.

"(f) If he is admitted with a minimum of 24 semester hours or a minimum of 36 quarter hours of advanced placement from a CEEB examination (or from a similar proficiency examination) and /or concurrent high school-college credit without previous enrollment at a collegiate institution, he shall be immediately eligible for all NCAA championships. Credits earned from extension or summer session courses may not be counted in satisfaction of this requirement.

"(g) He must not have received or satisfied the requirements for a baccalaureate or equivalent degree, or he must not have completed his eligibility for participation as a graduate student under the provisions of Constitution 3-3-(c), except that a student who is eligible during the term in which he completes his work for the degree (or his graduate eligibility as referred to above) remains eligible for any NCAA championship that begins within 60 days after he completes the requirements for the degree (or his graduate eligibility).

"(h) He must not have engaged in any athletic competition under an assumed name, or with intent otherwise to deceive.

"(i) His enrollment or attendance shall not have been so-

licit by the certifying institution or any representative of its athletic interests in violation of the Association's legislation as acknowledged by the institution or established through the Association's enforcement procedures. The certifying institution may appeal to the Eligibility Committee for restoration of his eligibility.

"(j) He must conform to the following provisions for eligibility for competition and practice and financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree).

[Note: A 2.000 achiever as used herein is defined as one who at the time of his graduation from high school presented an accumulative sixth, seventh or eighth semester minimum grade point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000), or, subsequent to graduation from high school, presented a minimum grade point average of 2.000 after at least one academic year of attendance at and graduation from a preparatory school, as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence.]

"(1) For entering freshmen with no previous college attendance:

"a. For those who matriculated as 2.000 achievers, financial aid and eligibility for competition and practice shall be limited only by institutional and conference regulations.

"b. For those who matriculated as 2.000 non-achievers:

"1. For student-athletes as defined in O.I. 100, financial aid, competition and practice are not permitted during the first academic year in residence.

"2. For students whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests per O.I. 100, and whose admission and aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability, competition and practice are not permitted. Financial aid is permitted provided there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty representative, the admissions officer and the chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies.

"(2) After the freshman year for student-athletes who are not transfers: Financial aid and eligibility for competition shall be limited only by official institutional regulations governing normal progress toward a degree for all students and other applicable institutional and conference eligibility rules.

"(3) For transfer student-athletes:

"a. From four-year institutions:

"1. Eligibility for varsity competition is not permitted for one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year from his first registration date at the certifying institution.

"2. Eligibility for aid and practice:

"(i) For 2.000 achievers, there shall be no restrictions except that the student-athlete must be eligible under the rules of his institution as well as the rules of the conference of which his institution is a member.

"(ii) For 2.000 non-achievers who have attended a collegiate

institution less than one full year, financial aid, competition and practice are not permitted during the first academic year.

"b. From junior colleges:

"1. For 2.000 achiever: To be eligible for financial aid and competition immediately, he must have:

"(i) Graduated from the junior college, or

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.000 and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college.

"2. For 2.000 non-achiever: To be eligible for financial aid and competition immediately, he must have:

"(i) Graduated from the junior college, or

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 48 semester hours or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.000 and spent at least two academic years (four semesters or six quarters) in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions), or

"(iii) Presented a minimum of 36 semester hours or 48 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative grade point average of 2.250 and spent at least three semesters or four quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions), or

"(iv) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative grade point average of 2.500 and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions).

"c. From foreign institutions: Students from foreign institutions (college, university or junior college), except those entering as bona fide exchange students, must comply with Bylaw 4-1-(j)-(3)-a-1. A bona fide foreign exchange student includes one who is sent by his government or is sponsored by the U.S. Department of State, Rotary International, the Ford Foundation, the Institute of International Education or similar organizations.

"(k) He must conform to the following additional transfer provisions:

"(1) A student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at any four-year college must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution, unless he has completed a minimum of 24 semester hours or a minimum of 36 quarter hours at the junior college following his transfer from the four-year college and also has graduated from the junior college, or is readmitted to the four-year college first attended.

"(2) A student who transfers from a collegiate institution while he is disqualified or suspended for disciplinary reasons must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution.

"(3) If a student-athlete attends a four-year institution, transfers to a junior college, and prior to graduation from junior college he enrolls at another four-year institution, he shall be subject to the one-year residence requirement, even though

during the course of that one-year residence he may earn sufficient credits to obtain a degree at the junior college; further, if a junior college student transfers to and attends a four-year institution, he is subject to the one-year residence requirement of this provision at that institution, even though he transfers back to the junior college and obtains a degree.

"(l) He must be in conformance with the following interpretations regarding transfer students:

"(1) A student shall be considered a transfer from a collegiate institution when its registrar or admissions officer certifies that the student was officially registered and enrolled at said institution on the opening day of classes in any quarter or semester, or that the student attended a class or classes in any quarter or semester or the athletic director certifies that the student reported on call for regular uniformed squad practice prior to the beginning of any quarter or semester.

"(2) A student shall not be considered a transfer:

"a. After enrollment or attendance only at classes in a summer school, night school or extension course;

"b. After enrollment or attendance only at classes in a branch school provided the branch school does not conduct an intercollegiate athletic program; [Note: A branch school is defined as an educational institution which usually offers two years of college work, does not award degrees and is wholly controlled and operated by a four-year degree-granting parent institution. If the branch school conducts an intercollegiate athletic program, the transferring student shall not be considered a transfer upon his enrollment at the parent institution directly from the branch school; if he enrolls in another four-year institution directly from the branch school, his eligibility shall be determined by the junior college provisions above.]

"c. Upon return to his original institution after participation in a cooperative educational exchange program, provided he is to receive his baccalaureate degree from the institution from which he transferred to participate in the exchange program;

"d. Upon return to his original institution after attendance of one semester or quarter at another institution for purposes of taking academic courses not available at his original institution;

"e. Upon return to his original institution after attendance of one academic year at another collegiate institution in accordance with the program recommended by the appropriate academic officer at the original institution, provided he was in good academic standing at the time he left the original institution;

"f. If the NCAA Eligibility Committee concludes that he changed institutions in order to continue his major course of study because his original institution discontinued the academic program of his major;

"g. Upon return from at least 18 months of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States or from at least 18 months of active service on an official church mission;

"h. If the NCAA Eligibility Committee concludes that he

changed institutions in order to continue participation in his sport because his original institution dropped the sport from its intercollegiate organization.

"1. If he is an alien student who is required to transfer one or more times because of a study program predetermined by his government or the sponsoring educational organization.

"(3) A transfer student, upon completion of two full semesters or three full quarters of academic work and after a full calendar year has elapsed, shall be eligible for any NCAA championship that is in progress at the time he completes the respective periods. (Example: If the first-round game of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship were to be held on March 8, the final game on March 24 and a transfer student completed his calendar year of residence between March 8 and March 24, he would be eligible to participate in all games of the tournament.)

"(4) In the administration of the various semester hours or quarter hours of transferable degree credit for a transfer student, all grades earned by a student in courses which would be transferable to the certifying institution must be included in determining whether the student has earned the required average. All grades earned in courses which are not transferable to the certifying institution, irrespective of the grade earned, shall not be included in determining whether the student has earned the required average.

[Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Article 4 remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Intent: To consolidate the provisions of Sections 1 and 6-(b) of the present Article 4; to retain the most demanding requirements of each Section where similarities exist, and to require their application to the eligibility of student-athletes in all sports for practice, participation in regular-season athletic competition and, where noted, for athletically related financial aid, if an institution desires to be eligible to enter teams and individuals in NCAA championship events or certified postseason football games.

Action: Part A defeated by each division by voice vote. Part B approved as amended (see No. 163) by all three divisions: Division II, voice vote; Division III, show of paddles; Division I, 45-42.

NO. 36 TRANSFER RULE

Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 400, following Bylaw 4-1-(d), page 49, and renumber subsequent O.I.'s, as follows:

"O.I. 400. A transfer student from another four-year collegiate institution, per Bylaw 4-1-(d) above, may participate on junior varsity, freshman or other sub-varsity teams during the calendar year following his first registration at the certifying institution.

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit transfers from four-year institutions to participate

on the sub-varsity level, but not at the varsity level, during their first year at the certifying institution, if Proposal No. 35 is adopted. If Proposal No. 35 is defeated, the Council intends to withdraw this interpretation.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 37 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6, page 56, by adding a new paragraph (f), as follows:

"(f) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament in a particular sport unless the institution in the conduct of that intercollegiate sport limits its scholarships, grant-in-aid awards and other financial assistance (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in competition and in organized athletic practice sessions in that sport during the first year in residence, to not more than the following number of student-athletes per year who were not, at the time of initial contact between a representative of the member institution and the student-athlete, either citizens of the United States or aliens who had been lawfully admitted to the United States: Cross Country/Track and Field—One. Gymnastics—One. Ice Hockey—Two. Skiing—One. Soccer—One."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Foreign Athletic Recruitment).

Intent: To limit the athletic recruitment of alien athletes through legislation which is considered appropriate under the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Action: Defeated as amended (see No. 164) by each division by voice vote.

NO. 38 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(c), page 49, as follows:

"(c) He must, at the time of competition, be registered for at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by his institution, which, in any event, shall not be less than twelve semester hours or twelve quarter hours; or, if the competition takes place between terms, he must have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition. The twelve semester or quarter hour requirement of this paragraph may be waived for a full-time student who resides in his final (eighth) semester or (twelfth) quarter of his baccalaureate program, provided that his institution's registrar certifies that he is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete his degree requirements as determined by the faculty of his institution. The student granted eligibility under this exception shall also be eligible for NCAA competition which takes place immediately following said eighth semester or twelfth quarter; however, the student shall thereafter forfeit all eligibility. This waiver provision shall be administered by the allied confer-

ences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a full-time student who has accelerated his academic program during his initial 3½ years of college residence to participate in NCAA competition during his final semester or quarter while carrying fewer than 12 hours of credit.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 39 FIVE-YEAR RULE

A. Constitution: Delete Article 3, Section 9-(a), and O.I. 18, page 16, relettering subsequent paragraphs.

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, page 49, by adding a new paragraph (d) and a new O.I. 400, relettering and renumbering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(d) He must complete his seasons of participation within five calendar years from the beginning of the semester or quarter in which he first registered at a collegiate institution, time spent in the armed services, on official church missions or with recognized foreign aid services of the U.S. Government being excepted. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this paragraph on behalf of student-athletes of the national service academies who have exhausted eligibility in one sport, but wish to compete in another sport or sports in which they have eligibility remaining.

"O.I. 400. If a student-athlete enrolls in a regular term of a collegiate institution at the first opportunity following completion of any one of the three commitments described in the exceptions to Bylaw 4-1-(d), the elapsed time between completion of his commitment and enrollment will not count toward his five-year period of eligibility."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To make the five-year rule as it is currently written a part of Bylaw 4 rather than the Constitution, thereby limiting its application to the eligibility of individual student-athletes for NCAA events and certified postseason competition in football. The rule would not be applicable for in-season eligibility unless implemented by member institutions and their conferences.

Action: Part A defeated by show of paddles; therefore, Part B ruled out of order.

NO. 40 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f), page 50, as follows:

"(f) He must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity intercollegiate competition after his freshman year, it being understood that:"

[Remaining paragraphs remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that this rule applies to all intercollegiate competition rather than to varsity only.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 41 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f), page 50, as follows:

"(f) He must not previously have engaged in *three four* seasons of *freshman, junior varsity, junior college or varsity* competition *after his freshman year*, it being understood that:"

[Remaining paragraphs remain unchanged.]

Source: Pacific Coast Athletic Association, Chapman College.

Intent: To permit four years of intercollegiate competition after the freshman year, provided that the student-athlete did not compete during his freshman year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 24-139; defeated by Division III, 21-30; approved by Division II, 42-37. Motion to rescind Division II vote approved, 290-67.

NO. 42 HARDSHIP

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 400, following Bylaw 4-1-(f)-(1), page 50, as follows:

"O.I. 400. 'Hardship' is that incapacitating condition resulting from injury or illness which occurs in one of the *three four* seasons of varsity competition *after the student-athlete's freshman year*, and which prevents him from participating in more than one football game, or in more than three contests in other sports, provided the injury or illness occurred during the first half of the institution's regular schedule in the sport involved. This provision shall be administered by the allied conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To make the "hardship" provisions applicable to any one of the student-athlete's four seasons of competition.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 43 HARDSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f), page 50, as follows:

"(f) He must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition after his freshman year, *except that if injury or illness (as certified by the doctor-director of the institution's health service) prevents his participation in any practice or competition in all sports during his freshman year, he shall not be charged with loss of his freshman year, it being understood that:*"

[Remaining paragraphs remain unchanged.]

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To provide for limited restoration of the freshman year of eligibility in the "hardship" situation described.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 44 **HARDSHIP**

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 400, following Bylaw 4-1-(f)-(1), page 50, as follows:

"O.I. 400. 'Hardship' is that incapacitating condition resulting from injury or illness which occurs in one of the three seasons of varsity competition after the student-athlete's freshman year, and which prevents him from participating in more than one two football games, or in more than three contests in other sports, provided the injury or illness occurred during the first half of the institution's regular schedule in the sport involved. This provision shall be administered by the allied conferences of the Association or, in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: Big Eight Conference, Big Ten Conference, Mid-American Conference, Missouri Valley Conference, Southern Conference, Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To increase by one game the latitude for "hardship" consideration in the sport of football.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 45 **INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY**

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(2), page 55, as follows:

"(2) Limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics to student-athletes who meet the official institutional regulations governing normal progress toward a degree for all students, as well as any other applicable institutional eligibility rules as they specifically relate to eligibility for such benefits, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member, and"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify "applicable institutional and conference eligibility rules" by stating that such rules must specifically relate to eligibility for financial aid, practice and/or participation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 46 **OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP**

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2, page 19, by adding a new paragraph (d) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(d) To administer annually on a form prescribed by the Council a signed statement for each student-athlete in accordance with Constitution 3-9-(j), as follows:

"(1) The statement shall be individually administered to each student-athlete by the director of athletics prior to the student's participation in intercollegiate competition each academic year.

"(2) The director of athletics and head coach in the sport in

which the student-athlete participates shall sign each statement as required by the prescribed form.

"(3) The statement shall be kept on file in the office of the director of athletics, and such file shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of another member institution, the NCAA and, as to members of an allied conference, an authorized representative of the conference."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Foreign Athletic Recruitment, Special Committee on Enforcement, Special Committee on Recruiting).

Intent: To establish institutional obligations regarding administration of the annual statement described in Proposal No. 47.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 47 **ELIGIBILITY**

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9, page 18, by adding a new paragraph (j), as follows:

"(j) He shall annually, prior to participation in intercollegiate competition during the academic year in question, sign a statement in a form prescribed by the NCAA Council in which he submits information related to his eligibility, recruitment, financial aid and amateur status under the governing legislation of this Association. Failure to complete and sign the statement annually shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Foreign Athletic Recruitment, Special Committee on Enforcement, Special Committee on Recruiting).

Intent: To require student-athletes to complete and sign an annual statement as indicated so that all member institutions secure complete and like information on which to base eligibility decisions.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 48 **OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP**

Constitution: Add a new O.I. 20, following Constitution 4-2-(a), page 19, and renumber subsequent O.I.'s, as follows:

"O.I. 20. The Constitution, Bylaws and other legislation of this Association, unless otherwise specified therein, shall apply to all sports which a member institution annually designates to the NCAA as intercollegiate sports, or in which the Association conducts a national championship event, or in which the Association draws and maintains the official playing rules."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To affirm that the Association's legislation, and therefore the members' obligation to abide by that legislation, pertains only to those sports recognized as intercollegiate sports by the Association, and to define how that determination is made.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Tabled by voice vote.

NO. 49 ALLIED MEMBERS' VOTING PRIVILEGES

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 3-(b), page 20, as follows:

"(b) Allied members shall consist of athletic conferences or associations of colleges and universities, all the members of which are active members of this Association, duly elected to allied membership under the provisions of the Bylaws. A conference or an association with forty or more members may qualify as an allied member if ninety per cent of its member institutions are active members of the Association.

"(1) Allied members shall be entitled to all the privileges of active members, except the right to compete as such in meets, tournaments or contests under the auspices of the Association.

"(2) Only those allied members which meet the following criteria shall be permitted to vote on issues before the Association:

(i) The allied member must be both a competitive and legislative body.

(ii) It must be composed of at least six members in a single division.

(iii) Conference competition must be conducted in at least four sports with at least one in each season. A season-end tournament or round-robin regular-season play will satisfy this requirement."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Reorganization-1974).

Intent: To establish voting criteria for allied members.

Action: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 50 ATHLETIC CONSORTIUMS

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 8, page 21, as follows:

"Section 8. Athletic Consortiums. The Council may, by a two-thirds vote, approve an athletic consortium involving a member institution and neighboring member or non-member institutions, but not more than one non-member institution, to permit the combined student-athletes to compete on the NCAA member's intercollegiate athletic teams provided the student-athletes satisfy the eligibility requirements of the member institution and this Association. The Council shall develop and publish appropriate criteria to be applied to such consortiums."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that not more than one non-member institution may be included in an approved athletic consortium.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 51 DUES OF MEMBERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(a), page 65, by deleting the present language and substituting the following:

"Section 3. Dues of Members. (a) The annual dues of the various classes of membership shall be:

"(1) Active members which are Division I in both football and basketball, \$500.

"(2) Active members which are Division I in all sports except football, \$400.

"(3) Active members in Division II, \$200.

"(4) Active members in Division III, \$100.

"(5) Allied members in Division I in both football and basketball, \$250.

"(6) Allied members in Division I in all sports except football, \$200.

"(7) Allied members in Division II, \$100.

"(8) Allied members in Division III, \$50.

"(9) Associate members, \$50.

"(10) Affiliated members, \$50."

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To base the Association's dues structure on divisional membership rather than enrollment; and to revise the amount of dues in the various categories to provide, in effect, twice the current amount of dues collected with the additional amount thus raised, along with funds from the Association's television assessment, to be earmarked for an expanded enforcement program.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by each division by show of paddles.

NO. 52 TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 4-(c), pages 65-66, as follows:

"Section 4. Transfer of Membership. The following transfer of active members from their regular geographic districts is hereby made in accordance with Constitution 5-4:

"(c) From District 4 to District 5

"Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois."

Source: Southern Illinois University.

Intent: To transfer Southern Illinois University to District 5 in light of the institution's membership in the Missouri Valley Conference.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 53 CHANGE OF DIVISION

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 2, page 83, by adding a new paragraph (b), as follows:

"(b) The Council may grant exceptions to the June 1 and September 1 deadline provisions of this Section if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the Council to waive the deadlines for change of division.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 146) by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 54 CHANGE OF DIVISION

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (b), as follows:

"(b) Any member institution which is transferred to a new division in any or all sports, in accordance with the provisions of this Section, must continue to be a member of that new division for a minimum of three years. The Council shall have the authority to grant exceptions to this provision if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such consideration."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require that an institution which is granted a change of division in any or all sports must remain in the division to which it transfers for a period of at least three years, subject to the described waiver procedure.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 147) by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 55 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, page 83.

A. Amend Article 10, Section 1-(b), page 83, as follows:

"(b) An institution which is a member of Division II or Division III may elect to participate in Division I in one sport, other than football or basketball. If the request is approved by the Council, the institution must continue to be a member of Division I in that sport for a minimum of three years."

B. Amend Article 10, Section 2-(a), page 83, as follows:

"(a) An institution which is a member of Division II or Division III may elect to participate in Division I in one sport, other than football or basketball, in accordance with Bylaw 10-1-(b). The institution shall submit its request to the Association's executive director in writing not later than June 1. If the Council determines that a member has met all applicable criteria of Division I as they pertain to the sport in question, the member shall be eligible for said sport in Division I effective the September 1 following submission of the petition. The institution must continue to be a member of Division I in that sport for a minimum of three years."

Source: Big Sky Conference.

Intent: To permit a member institution in Division II or Division III to elect to participate in Division I in basketball.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 56 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, page 83.

A. Amend Article 10, Section 1, page 83, by adding a new paragraph (c) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(c) An institution which is a member of Division III may elect to participate in Division II in one sport, other than football or basketball, in addition to any one sport in which it may elect to participate in Division I. If the request is approved by

the Council, the institution must continue to be a member of Division II in that sport for a minimum of three years."

B. Amend Article 10, Section 2, page 83, by adding a new paragraph (b), as follows:

"(b) An institution which is a member of Division III may elect to participate in Division II in one sport, other than football or basketball, in accordance with Bylaw 10-1-(c). The institution shall submit its request to the Association's executive director in writing not later than June 1. If the Council determines that a member has met all applicable criteria of Division II as they pertain to the sport in question, the member shall be eligible for said sport in Division II effective the September 1 following submission of the petition. The institution must continue to be a member of Division II in that sport for a minimum of three years."

Source: California State University, Chico.

Intent: To permit a Division III institution to elect to participate in Division II in one sport, other than football or basketball, in addition to its privilege of electing to participate in Division I in one sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 57 MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(c), page 83, as follows:

"(c) By appropriate Bylaw, the members of each division may establish criteria for membership in that division, following which each institution in that division shall have five years from the date of adoption to conform to the requirements. If, after five years, an institution has not conformed to the criteria of its division, the Council shall reassign the institution to a division for which it qualifies, or if it does not qualify for any division, the institution shall be reclassified as an associate member. If an entire conference selects Division I in the sport of basketball, it shall be immediately reassigned by the Council."

Source: Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that when an entire conference selects Division I in the sport of basketball, the NCAA Council shall immediately reassign such a conference to Division I in that sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 58 DIVISION I CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1-(b), page 85, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(b) Institutions desiring to be members of Division I shall schedule at least seventy-five per cent of their basketball games against members of Division I. If a bona fide NCAA member institution finds it impossible to satisfy this criterion because of failure to obtain contracts for competition with Division I

institutions, it shall be the responsibility of the NCAA Council to assign a petitioning institution to Division I upon the institution's submission of proof of inability to obtain sufficient games with members of that Division."

Source: Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.

Intent: To establish a procedure by which an institution, unsuccessful in securing game contracts with a sufficient number of Division I opponents, shall be reassigned to Division I by the Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 59 DIVISION II CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, page 85, by adding a new Section 3, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to Division II members.]

"Section 3. Criteria for Division II Membership. Institutions which have elected Division II through the process of self-determination shall conform to the following criteria for membership in Division II no later than January 1, 1980. Other institutions must conform to the following criteria prior to making application for Division II membership.

"(a) Institutional members of Division II in the sport of football must schedule more than fifty per cent of their games against members of Division II or Division I in that sport.

"(b) Institutional members of Division II shall schedule at least two-thirds of their basketball games against members of Division II or Division I."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish criteria for membership in Division II, in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 10-1-(c).

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 60 DIVISION III CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2-(c), page 85, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to Division III members.]

"(c) The assistance offered each year may not exceed financial need as determined by the Parents' Confidential Statement of the College Scholarship Service, except for Academic Honor Awards which may be offered only to students in the upper 20 per cent of their high school graduating class."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish a minimum academic performance requirement for an incoming student to qualify for a permissible "Academic Honor Award" at a Division III member institution.

Action: Division III only: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 61 DIVISION III CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2, by adding a new paragraph (e), as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to Division III members.]

"(e) Tuition remission, assistance or similar remuneration granted as a benefit of employment to a faculty or staff member shall not be calculated in the application of the Division III financial need criteria in the case of that faculty member's children."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To exempt from the Division III need criteria tuition remission or like assistance granted to faculty members' offspring.

Action: Division III only: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 62 OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP— LEGAL COSTS

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2, page 19, by adding a new paragraph (e), as follows:

"(e) To exhaust all procedures for appeal and review of institutional and individual eligibility actions permitted by the governing legislation of the Association before it shall seek any judicial remedies; further, any member which brings legal action against the Association (or any of its members, Officers or agents), or directly or indirectly encourages or induces another to bring such a legal action, or fails to cooperate fully with the Association in the defense of such an action in which the Association is involved, wherein it is sought to stay the NCAA's enforcement procedures or eligibility rulings prior to fully exhausting NCAA procedures, may, when consistent with the results and upon termination of such legal action, and pursuant to the official procedure governing the NCAA enforcement program, in addition to all other disciplinary measures authorized under Section 7, be charged for all or part of the Association's actual expenses, including legal fees, incurred in defending such action, and may be subjected to disciplinary action and termination of membership for failing to fulfill conditions and obligations of membership under this Section."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To emphasize the obligation of a member to pursue internal appeal and review procedures of the Association instead of becoming involved, directly or indirectly, in legal actions designed to thwart administration of legislation adopted by the Association.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 63 RESTITUTION

Enforcement Procedure: Amend the Enforcement Procedure by adding a new Section 10, page 110, and renumbering the subsequent Section, as follows:

"Section 10. If a student-athlete who is ineligible under the

terms of the Constitution, Bylaws or other legislation of the Association is permitted to participate in intercollegiate competition contrary to such NCAA legislation but in accordance with the terms of a court restraining order or injunction operative against the institution attended by such student-athlete or the Association, or both, and said injunction is subsequently voluntarily vacated or finally determined to have been improvidently issued, the Council may take any one or more of the following actions against such institution in the interest of restitution and fairness to competing institutions:

"(a) Requirement that individual or team records and performances achieved during participation by such ineligible student-athlete shall be vacated or stricken;

"(b) Requirement that team victories achieved during participation by such ineligible student-athlete shall be abrogated and the games or events forfeited to the opposing institutions;

"(c) Requirement that individual or team awards earned during participation by such ineligible student-athlete shall be returned to the Association, the sponsor or the competing institution supplying same;

"(d) Determination of ineligibility for one or more National Collegiate Championship events in the sports and in the seasons in which such ineligible student-athlete participated;

"(e) Determination of ineligibility for invitational and post-season meets and tournaments in the sports and in the seasons in which such ineligible student-athlete participated;

"(f) Requirement that the institution shall remit to the NCAA the institution's share of television receipts for appearing in any national or regional telecast under the NCAA Football Television Plan where the Council concludes that the institution would not have been selected for such telecast but for the participation of such ineligible student-athlete during the season of the telecast. Any such funds thus remitted shall be devoted to the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Program.

"(g) Requirement that the institution which has been represented in an NCAA championship event by such a student-athlete shall return its share of the net receipts from such competition in excess of the regular expense reimbursement; or if said funds have not been distributed, requirement that they be withheld by the NCAA executive director."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To enable the NCAA Council to take one or more of the specified actions against a member institution by way of restitution, rather than as a penalty, based on the legal principle that a party who obtains benefit from an improperly issued injunction has a duty to restore that benefit to those who have been injured by the injunction.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 64 PENALTY STRUCTURE

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 7-(a)-(12), pages 107-108, as follows:

"(12) Requirement that a member institution which has been found in violation show cause why:

"(i) a penalty or an additional penalty shall not be imposed if, in the opinion of the Committee (or Council), it does not take appropriate disciplinary or corrective action against athletic department personnel involved in the infractions case, any other institutional employee if the circumstances warrant, the student-athlete involved or representatives of the institution's athletic interests; or

"(ii) a recommendation should not be made to the membership that the institution's membership in the Association be suspended or terminated if, in the opinion of the Committee (or Council), it does not take appropriate disciplinary or corrective action against the head coach of the sport involved, any other institutional employee if the circumstances warrant, the student-athlete involved or representatives of the institution's athletic interests.

"Appropriate disciplinary or corrective action' may include, for example, termination of the coaching contract of the head coach and any assistants involved; suspension or termination of the employment status of any other institutional employee who may be involved; declaration of ineligibility for any student-athlete involved for a specific period;"

[Remainder of paragraph remains unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To eliminate references to disciplinary or corrective actions against student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 65 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(d), page 56, as follows:

"(d) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless its chief executive officer certifies annually on a form and by a date approved by the NCAA Council that (1) he or his designated representative has reviewed with all athletic department staff members the rules and regulations of the Association as they apply to the administration and conduct of intercollegiate athletics; (2) the policies, procedures and practices of the institution, its staff members and representatives of athletic interests are in compliance at the present time with the Association's legislation insofar as he can determine; (3) a current statement has been filed with the chief executive officer, as a part of the institution's annual certification, which is signed by each athletic department staff member (except for

clerical personnel) attesting that the staff member has reported his knowledge of and involvement in any violations of NCAA legislation involving the institution, and (4) it is the intention of the institution to maintain such compliance."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Enforcement, Special Committee on Recruiting).

Intent: To require each athletic department staff member to sign an annual statement concerning rules violations, as a part of the chief executive officer's annual certification.

Action: Defeated by each division: Division I, 68-124; Division II, voice vote; Division III, voice vote. Motion to reconsider approved by all three divisions by single voice vote. Reconsideration: Approved by each division by show of paddles.

NO. 66 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(d), page 56, as follows:

"(d) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless its chief executive officer certifies annually on a form and by a date approved by the NCAA Council that (1) he or his designated representative has reviewed with all athletic department staff members the rules and regulations of the Association as they apply to the administration and conduct of intercollegiate athletics, and that within the preceding three years no member of the institution's coaching staff has been found by the Committee on Infractions, the Council or the annual Convention following an official inquiry to have violated any of the principles of ethical conduct enunciated in Constitution 3-6-(a); (2) the policies, procedures and practices of the institution, its staff members and representatives of athletic interests are in compliance at the present time with the Association's legislation insofar as he can determine, and (3) it is the intention of the institution to maintain such compliance."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To make effective sanctions on professional coaching staff members who have violated the fundamental standards of conduct enunciated by the NCAA.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 148) by all three divisions by single voice vote. Motion to reconsider defeated by voice vote.

NO. 67 PERSONNEL

Recommended Policies: Amend Recommended Policy 6, page 101, by adding a new Section 4, as follows:

"Section 4. Prior to a person's possible employment as a member of the department of intercollegiate athletics, a member institution should give careful consideration to whether he previously has been involved in violations of NCAA legislation."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Enforcement).

Intent: To encourage member institutions to exercise caution in employing individuals who have been involved in violations of Association legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 68 OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERSHIP

Constitution: Amend O.I. 20, following Constitution 4-2-(a), page 18, as follows:

"O.I. 20. If a student-athlete is ineligible under the terms of the Constitution, Bylaws or other legislation of the Association, the institution shall be obligated immediately to apply the applicable rule to the student-athlete and withhold him from all intercollegiate competition, except, where required by institutional policy, the student-athlete shall receive notice and an opportunity for hearing with respect to his ineligibility but in no case shall such a hearing and a final decision extend beyond thirty days from notification by the NCAA. Subsequent to this action, the member institution may appeal to the NCAA Council, or a subcommittee designated by the Council to act for it, if the member concludes that the circumstances warrant restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility.

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To allow 30 days for a due process hearing by the institution on questions of student-athlete eligibility where the institution has established procedures on questions of student discipline and sanctions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 69 INSTITUTIONAL HEARING

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 5, page 106, by adding the following to the present language:

"... except that where a penalty is to be imposed on a student-athlete or staff member, the student-athlete or staff member shall be entitled to receive notice and an opportunity for hearing if such is required by the student disciplinary or personnel procedures of the student-athlete's or staff member's institution, but in no case shall such a hearing and final decision extend beyond thirty days from notification by the NCAA."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To provide 30 days for a due process hearing by the institution on questions of student-athlete and staff personnel discipline where the institution has established procedures which require utilization of such processes prior to the imposition of sanctions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 70 DISCIPLINE OF MEMBERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 5-(e), page 67, as follows:

"(e) The Committee on Infractions shall determine whether it

shall itself impose disciplinary measures authorized by Constitution 4-6, or recommend that such action be taken by the Council or next annual Convention. Any disciplinary measure imposed upon the member institution shall be clearly noted at the conclusion of the action by the Committee on Infractions, Council or Convention, as the case may be, and shall include but not be limited to (1) any penalties or sanctions, such as ineligibility, imposed upon specific student-athletes or the staff of the member institution, (2) the adjustment of individual and team standings and (3) the return of any awards and net receipts received as a result of participation in an NCAA championship."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To require various NCAA bodies, in imposing disciplinary measures on a member institution, to state all such measures clearly in one place so the member institution can properly understand its obligations and evaluate its course of action.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 71 ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 4-(b), page 106, by adding the following to the present language:

"Any disciplinary measure imposed upon the member institution shall be clearly noted at the conclusion of the action by the Committee on Infractions, Council or Convention, as the case may be, and shall include but not be limited to (1) any penalties or sanctions, such as ineligibility, imposed upon specific student-athletes or the staff of the member institution, (2) the adjustment of individual and team standings and (3) the return of any awards and net receipts received as a result of participation in an NCAA championship."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To require various NCAA bodies, in imposing disciplinary measures on a member institution, to state all such measures clearly in one place so that the member institution can properly understand its obligations and evaluate its course of action.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 72 PENALTY STRUCTURE

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 7-(a), pages 107-108, as follows:

"Section 7. (a) The Constitution of the Association provides that disciplinary or corrective actions other than termination or suspension of membership may be effected during the period between annual Conventions by the Committee on Infractions. As a guiding principle, the NCAA penalty should be broad and severe if the violation or violations reflect a general disregard for the governing rules; in those instances in which the violation or violations are isolated and of relative insignificance,

then the NCAA penalty shall be specific and limited. Any penalty shall, however, be appropriate with the severity of the violation. Previous violations of NCAA legislation shall be a contributing factor in determining the degree of penalty. The Committee shall avoid institutional penalties which impose mass penalties on all athletes in a specific sport or on all athletes in every sport sponsored by the penalized institution. The participation opportunities of innocent student-athletes shall be carefully protected in all instances.

"Among the disciplinary measures, singly or in combination, which may be adopted by the Committee or Council and imposed against an institution, its staff and student-athletes are the following:

"(b) Individual penalties:

"(1) Reprimand and censure;

"(2) Ineligibility of a student-athlete or staff member for a time certain;

"(3) Disciplinary action against staff members and sanctions against representatives of the institution's athletic interests as noted in Enforcement 7-(c)-(12).

"(c) Institutional penalties:

[Paragraphs (1) through (10) remain unchanged.]

"(11) Requirement that an institution which has been represented in an NCAA championship event by a student-athlete who was recruited or received improper benefits (which would not necessarily render him ineligible) in violation of NCAA legislation shall return its share of net receipts from such competition in excess of the regular expense reimbursement and any amount paid to an allied member under the rules of such allied member; or if said funds have not been distributed, they shall be withheld by the NCAA executive director; or individual or team records and performances shall be vacated or stricken; or individual or team awards shall be returned to the Association, or any combination of the preceding penalties;"

[Paragraph (12) remains unchanged.]

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To preclude the levying of broad penalties affecting all student-athletes; to specify clearly that there are individual as well as institutional penalties which are levied by the Association, and to avoid penalizing an institution twice by requiring it to return net receipts that have already been sent, or are required to be sent, to the allied member (i.e., its conference).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Motion to consider first paragraph separately approved by voice vote. First paragraph tabled by show of paddles. Remainder of No. 72 tabled by voice vote.

NO. 73 ENFORCEMENT POLICY

Enforcement Procedure: Add the following to the introductory text, immediately preceding Section 1, page 104:

"The basic policy of the NCAA penalty program is to punish the guilty to the same proportionate degree as the severity of

the violation. The Committee on Infractions will avoid mass penalties placed on all athletes in a specific sport or on institutional penalties placed on all athletes in every sport sponsored by that institution. The participation opportunities of innocent student-athletes will be carefully protected."

Source: University of Kansas.

Intent: To preclude the levying of broad penalties affecting all student-athletes as a basic policy of the NCAA enforcement program.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Tabled by voice vote.

NO. 74 PENALTY STRUCTURE

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 7-(a), page 107, as follows:

"Section 7. (a) The Constitution of the Association provides that disciplinary or corrective actions other than termination or suspension of membership may be effected during the period between annual Conventions by the Committee on Infractions. As a guiding principle, the NCAA penalty should be broad and severe if the violation or violations reflect a general disregard for the governing rules; in those instances in which the violation or violations are isolated and of relative insignificance, then the NCAA penalty shall be specific and limited. Any penalty shall, however, be commensurate with the severity of the violation. Previous violations of NCAA legislation shall be a contributing factor in determining the degree of penalty. The Committee shall avoid mass penalties placed on all athletes in a specific sport, or institutional penalties placed on all athletes in every sport sponsored by the penalized institution. The participation opportunities of innocent student-athletes shall be carefully protected in all instances."

Source: University of Kansas.

Intent: To preclude the levying of broad penalties affecting all student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Tabled by voice vote.

NO. 75 COUNTABLE PLAYERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, pages 57-59.

[Note: The following proposals are applicable only to members of Division I and Division II.]

A. Amend Article 5, Section 3-(b), page 57, as follows:

"(b) He was recruited and engages in intercollegiate competition as a member of a varsity team is receiving financial aid as set forth in O.I. 500."

B. Amend Article 5, Section 4, page 57, by adding a new paragraph (c), as follows:

"(c) He was recruited, but does not receive financial aid as set forth in O.I. 500."

C. Delete O.I. 501, following Bylaw 5-8, page 59, as follows:

"O.I. 501. A recruited player who is not receiving financial aid,

or who is receiving financial aid granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability, does not have to be counted until he engages in intercollegiate competition related to the varsity program in that sport. For this provision to be applicable, there shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and the chairman of the financial aid committee that the student's admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that a player must be counted in accordance with the maximum awards limitations if he was recruited and is receiving financial aid as set forth in O.I. 500; that a player is exempted from the counting procedure if he was recruited but does not receive athletically related financial aid, and to eliminate O.I. 501 in view of those changes.

Action: Divisions I and II only: Defeated as amended (see No. 150) by both divisions by single show of paddles.

NO. 76 COUNTABLE PLAYERS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 501, following Bylaw 5-8, page 59, as follows:

"O.I. 501. A recruited player who is not receiving financial aid, or who is receiving financial aid granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability, does not have to be counted until he engages in intercollegiate competition related to the varsity program in that sport other than as a member of the institution's freshman team. For this provision to be applicable, there shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and the chairman of the financial aid committee that the student's admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide that a recruited player who is not receiving athletically related financial aid need not be counted when he engages in intercollegiate competition in his sport as a member of the institution's freshman team. [Note: The Council intends to present this proposal if Proposal No. 75 fails.]

Action: Divisions I and II only: Defeated by both divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 77 COUNTABLE PLAYERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 3, page 57, by adding a new paragraph (c), as follows.

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I and Division II.]

"(c) Players to be counted per paragraphs (a) and (b) above shall be counted against the maximum initial awards table in the year in which athletically related financial aid is realized or in which intercollegiate competition takes place."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify the year a countable player shall be counted in the maximum initial awards permitted in his sport.

Action: Divisions I and II only: Approved by both divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 78 INITIAL AWARDS—FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 7, page 58, as follows:

"Section 7. Changes in Participation. If a player changes sports, his initial award shall be counted in the maximum limitations for his first sport and, if he continues to receive financial aid, his award shall be counted the next academic year against the maximum limitations in his second sport. A player shall be counted as an initial award in football or basketball during the year he first becomes countable in those sports regardless of whether he previously received countable financial aid for another sport."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require that when a student-athlete first becomes countable in the sport of football or basketball, he shall be recorded in the initial award category.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Divisions I and II only: Approved by both divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 79 MULTIPLE SPORT PARTICIPANTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 58, as follows:

"Section 6. Multiple Sport Participants. A player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and practices or competes in football and one or more other sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football. A player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and practices or competes in basketball and one or more other sports (other than football) shall be counted in the sport of basketball. A player in two or more sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in one of the sports, but need not be counted in the other."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To apply the counting provisions to both practice and competition, rather than competition only, for multiple sport participants.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Divisions I and II only: Approved by each division by show of paddles. Motion to reconsider defeated by voice vote.

NO. 80 MULTIPLE SPORT PARTICIPANTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 58, as follows:

"Section 6. Multiple Sport Participants. A player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and competes on the varsity level in football and one or more other sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football. A

player who is counted in the maximum awards limitations and competes on the varsity level in basketball and one or more other sports (other than football) shall be counted in the sport of basketball. A player in two or more sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in one of the sports, but need not be counted in the other."

Source: St. John's University (N.Y.)

Intent: To apply the counting provisions to competition on the varsity level only for multiple sport participants, thus permitting such student-athletes to participate at the sub-varsity level without counting against the maximum awards limitations in football or basketball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Ruled out of order due to approval of No. 79.

NO. 81 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(c), page 58, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(c) Football—Division I. There shall be an annual limit on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further, there shall be an annual limit on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year, including initial awards. The following limitations are applicable: *Thirty Thirty-five* maximum initial awards per year, with no more than sixty in any two-year period. One hundred five maximum awards in effect the same year."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To provide added flexibility to the current limitations regarding initial awards in the sport of football, without increasing the number of initial awards permitted in a two-year period.

Action: Division I only: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 82 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(c) and (d), page 58, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"(c) Football—Division I. There shall be an annual limit on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further there shall be an annual limit on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year, including initial awards. The following limitations are applicable: *Thirty* maximum initial awards per year. One hundred five maximum awards in effect the same year.

"(d) Basketball—Division I. There shall be an annual limit on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further, there shall be an annual limit on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year, including initial awards. The following limitations are applicable: *Six* maximum initial awards per year. Eighteen maximum awards in effect the same year."

Source: Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Intent: To eliminate the initial awards limits in the sports of football and basketball in Division I and to retain the present limitations on the total number of awards which may be in effect at any one time in those sports.

Action: Division I only: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 83 CHANGES IN PARTICIPATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 7, page 58; as follows:

"Section 7. Changes in Participation. If a player changes sports, his initial award shall first be counted in the maximum limitations for his first sport and, if he continues to receive financial aid, his award shall be counted the next academic year against the maximum limitations in his second sport."

Source: Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Intent: To adjust this provision to conform to Proposal No. 82.

Action: Ruled out of order due to defeat of No. 82.

NO. 84 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5, pages 57-58.

[Note: The following proposals are applicable only to members of Division I and Division II.]

A. Amend Article 5, Section 5-(a), page 57, as follows:

"(a) In each sport, except football and basketball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upper-classmen."

B. Amend Article 5, Section 5-(b), page 57, as follows:

"(b) Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: Baseball—Nineteen. Basketball—Eighteen. Cross Country/Track—Twenty-three. Fencing—Eight. Golf Eight. Gymnastics—Twelve. Ice Hockey—Twenty-three. Lacrosse—Twenty-three. Skiing—Twelve. Soccer—Nineteen. Swimming—Nineteen. Tennis—Eight. Volleyball—Eight. Water Polo—Eight. Wrestling—Nineteen."

C. Amend Article 5, Section 5, pages 57-58, by deleting paragraphs (d) and (f), as follows:

"(d) Basketball—Division I. There shall be an annual limit on the number of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further, there shall be an annual limit on the total number of financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year, including initial awards. The following limitations are applicable: Six maximum initial awards per year. Eighteen maximum awards in effect the same year.

"(f) Basketball—Division II. There shall be an annual limit on the value of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further, there shall be an annual limit on the number of additional financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year. The following limitations are applicable:

Six maximum initial awards per year. Twelve maximum additional awards in effect the same year."

Source: Utah State University.

Intent: To eliminate the initial awards limits in the sport of basketball in Divisions I and II; to apply an overall limit on the value of awards which may be in effect at any one time in the sport of basketball, and to delete paragraphs (d) and (f) in view of those changes.

Action: Divisions I and II only: Defeated by both divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 85 MAXIMUM AWARDS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(e), page 15, as follows:

"(e) The Bylaws of the Association may prescribe limitations as to the number and value of financial aid awards a member institution may provide to student-athletes, provided the value is in accordance with the requirements of Constitution 3-1-(f) and Constitution 3-4-(b)."

[Note: The following proposals are applicable only to members of Division I and Division II.]

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5, Page 57, as follows:

"Section 5. Maximum Awards. A member institution shall not make an award of financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) in excess of the number and value permitted by the following rules:

"(a) In each sport, except football and basketball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upper-classmen. Further, for all sports other than football and basketball, the value of each individual award shall not exceed tuition and fees at the awarding institution."

C. Amend O.I. 502, following Bylaw 5-8, page 59, as follows:

"O.I. 502. A member institution may not provide a student-athlete with financial aid in excess of 'commonly accepted educational expenses' as that defined and controlled by Constitution 3-1-(f), and Constitution 3-4 and Bylaw 5-5(a)."

D. Amend O.I. 505-(a), following Bylaw 5-8, page 60, as follows:

"(a) With respect to sports other than football or basketball, a member institution of either division may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) so long as the total dollar amount expended does not exceed the value of 'commonly accepted educational expenses' tuition and fees at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:

"The institution shall count the actual amount of money a student-athlete is awarded or receives for room, board, tuition and fees as well as books and course-related supplies (which may not exceed two hundred dollars per academic year) and

fifteen dollars per month for incidental expenses up to a maximum of one hundred thirty-five dollars for a full academic year (nine months times fifteen dollars). The actual amount he receives in ratio to the actual total maximum amount he could receive for each item listed herein tuition and fees shall represent a fraction of the maximum award utilized. The sum of all fractional and maximum awards received by student-athletes shall not exceed the total limit each year in the sport in question."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To limit the amount of individual athletically related financial aid awards to tuition and fees for all sports except football and basketball.

Action: Part A defeated by show of paddles; therefore, Part B ruled out of order (also see No. 151).

NO. 86 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(b), page 57, as follows:

"(b) Following are the maximum awards which may be in effect at any one time: Baseball—Nineteen. Cross Country/Track—Twenty-three. Fencing—Eight. Golf—Eight. Gymnastics—Twelve. Ice Hockey—Twenty-three. Lacrosse—Twenty-three. Skiing—Twelve. Soccer—Nineteen. Swimming/Water Polo—Nineteen. Tennis—Eight. Volleyball—Eight. Water Polo—Eight. Wrestling—Nineteen."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To combine swimming and water polo grants for a total of nineteen awards, similar to the manner in which cross country and track awards are combined.

Action: Divisions I and II only: Defeated by both divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 87 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(e), page 58, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II in football.]

"(e) Football—Division II. There shall be an annual limit on the value of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further, there shall be an annual limit on the number value of additional financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year. The following limitations are applicable: Thirty maximum initial awards per year. Seventy-five maximum additional awards in effect the same year."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the counting of additional awards on an equivalency basis in the sport of football in Division II.

Action: Division II football only: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 88 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(f), page 58, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

"(f) Basketball—Division II. There shall be an annual limit on the value of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further, there shall be an annual limit on the number value of additional financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year. The following limitations are applicable: Six maximum initial awards per year. Twelve maximum additional awards in effect the same year."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the counting of additional awards on an equivalency basis in the sport of basketball in Division II.

Action: Division II only: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 89 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 5-(e), page 58, as follows:

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II in football.]

"(e) Football—Division II. For institutions desiring to be eligible for the Division II Football Championship, There shall be an annual limit on the value of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further, there shall be an annual limit on the number value of additional financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year. The following limitations are applicable: Thirty Five maximum initial awards per year. Seventy-five Thirty-five maximum additional awards in effect the same year. (Effective: 9/1/76)"

Source: North Central Conference.

Intent: To permit the counting of additional awards on an equivalency basis in the sport of football in Division II, and to reduce the permissible initial awards from thirty to fifteen and the permissible additional awards from seventy-five to thirty-five, effective September 1, 1976; but exempting from the limits those Division II institutions in the sport of football which do not wish to be eligible for the Division II Football Championship.

Effective Date: September 1, 1976.

Action: Withdrawn (also see No. 152).

NO. 90 AWARDS ADMINISTRATION

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 505, following Bylaw 5-8.

[Note: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division II.]

A. Amend O.I. 505-(a), page 60, as follows:

"(a) With respect to sports other than football or basketball in Division I, and with respect to all sports in Division II, a member institution of either division may administer such awards to any number of recipients on the basis of value (equivalency) so long as the total dollar amount expended does not exceed the value of 'commonly accepted educational expenses' at that institution multiplied by the number of maximum awards permitted for the particular sport. The following computational method shall be utilized in administering this procedure:"

[Remainder of O.I. 505-(a) remains unchanged.]

B. Amend O.I. 505 by deleting paragraph (c), page 60, as follows:

"(c) In the sports of football and basketball, Division II members may administer initial awards on the basis of value (equivalency), as described in paragraph (a) of this interpretation, and shall administer additional awards on the basis of number, as described in paragraph (b) of this interpretation."

Source: North Central Conference.

Intent: To clarify and amend this interpretation in terms of Proposals Nos. 87, 88 and 89.

Effective Date: August 1, 1975.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 91 FINANCIAL AID DEFINITION

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 500, following Bylaw 5-8, page 59, as follows:

"O.I. 500. The term 'financial aid' as used in Bylaw 5 includes all institutional funds such as scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient; further, it includes as well as off-campus employment earnings and other sources of aid during the academic year for which the athletic interests of the institution intercede in behalf of the recipient; except that legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students shall not be considered accountable financial aid."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To exempt legitimate, repayable loans, under the specified conditions, from the financial aid definition as used in Bylaw 5.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Divisions I and II only: Approved by both divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 92 FINANCIAL AID—EMPLOYMENT

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(1), page 14, as follows:

"(1) Employment during semester or term time, which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing day of classes of the academic year semester, quarter, term or summer session, except for the vacation periods properly listed on the institution's official calendar."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that during any term, including summer sessions, athletically related financial aid received by a student-athlete for that term, in combination with income from employment, cannot exceed commonly accepted educational expenses.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 93 RECRUITING BENEFITS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 102, following Bylaw 1-1-(b), page 32, as follows:

"O.I. 102. The gift of any article of clothing or equipment (including training shirts bearing the institution's identification) to a prospective student-athlete shall be an improper inducement. An institution's staff member or any other representative of an institution's athletic interests shall not, during recruitment of an individual and prior to the individual's enrollment in the institution, be involved, directly or indirectly, in making arrangements for or giving or offering to give any financial aid or other benefits to the prospective student-athlete, his relatives or friends, other than expressly permitted by governing legislation of this Association. This prohibition shall apply regardless of whether similar financial aid, benefits or arrangements are available to prospective students in general, their relatives or friends. Specifically prohibited financial aid, benefits and arrangements include, but are not limited to: employment; gift of clothing or equipment; loans or the co-signing thereof; cash or like items; any tangible items including merchandise, free or reduced cost services or rental or purchases of any type, and free or reduced cost housing."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To prohibit during recruiting all financial aid, benefits or arrangements unless specifically permitted by governing legislation.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote (also see No. 153 and No. 165).

NO. 94 RECRUITING VISITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(c), pages 35-36, as follows:

"(c) No member institution shall permit more than one expense-paid visit to its campus under the authorization of Bylaws 1-5-(a) and (b). A prospective student-athlete may not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes of his senior year in high school, and the member institution shall not provide such a visit if the prospective student-athlete has already received expense-paid visits to four other member institutions. Institutions must keep on file a statement signed by each prospective student-athlete who receives an expense-paid visit attesting to the fact that he has not exceeded the requirements of this paragraph."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To restrict a prospective student-athlete's paid recruiting visits to not more than four member institutions and to establish a procedure whereby the prospective student-athlete must attest in writing to his conformance with that provision.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 95 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b), page 32, as follows:

"(b) No athletic staff member or other representative of the

institution's athletic interests shall contact a prospective student-athlete in person off campus for recruiting purposes (per O.I. 100) during the academic year until the prospect completes his junior year in high school.

"(c) Any staff member or other representative of a member institution's athletic interests desiring to contact a prospective student-athlete at his high school, college preparatory school or junior college shall first contact that institution's executive officer or his authorized representative, explain the purpose of his call and request permission to contact the student-athlete. Contact may be made at these places only when such permission is granted.

"(d) No contact with a prospective student-athlete shall be made at the site of his school's athletic competition when the prospect is a participant therein."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Recruiting).

Intent: To restrict off-campus contacts during the academic year with prospective student-athletes until they complete their junior year in high school.

Action: Approved by each division by show of paddles.

NO. 96 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, pages 31-40.

A. Amend Article 1, Section 1, page 32, by adding a new paragraph (c) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(c) No athletic staff member or other representative of the institution's athletic interests shall contact a prospective student-athlete in person off campus on more than three occasions for recruiting purposes."

B. Amend O.I. 124, following Bylaw 1-5-(i), page 38, as follows:

"O.I. 124. The limitation on total visits set forth in Bylaw 1-5 and the limitation on contacts for recruiting purposes set forth in Bylaw 1-1-(c) applies separately to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning with his enrollment in a college preparatory school or junior college."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To limit to three the number of in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts that may be made with any prospective student-athlete and to apply that limitation separately to the period when the prospect is in high school and to the period of his attendance at a preparatory school or junior college.

Action: Defeated as amended (see No. 154) by each division by show of paddles.

NO. 97 RECRUITING—TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, pages 31-40.

A. Amend Article 1, Section 2, page 33, as follows:

"Section 2. Use of Funds. (a) All funds for the recruiting of prospective student-athletes except those used by representatives of athletic interests in providing transportation to the campus for the one permissible expense-paid visit shall be deposited with the member institution which shall be exclusively

and entirely responsible for the manner in which it expends the funds.

"(b) No member institution shall permit any outside organization, agency or group of individuals to utilize, administer or expend funds for recruiting prospective student-athletes, including the transportation and entertainment of, and the giving of gifts or services to, prospective student-athletes or their relatives and friends.

"(c) The pooling of resources for such recruiting purposes by two or more persons shall constitute such a fund; except that this provision shall not apply to persons upon whom a prospective student-athlete may be naturally or legally dependent, nor to a person or persons providing transportation for the one permissible expense-paid visit."

B. Amend O.I. 108, following Bylaw 1-2-(c), page 34, as follows:

"O.I. 108. Use of a company's or non-institutional funds to pay the expenses incurred in transporting a prospective student-athlete to his campus constitutes the use of pooled resources must be substantiated by institutional records on file which indicate the date, method, cost and source of such transportation."

C. Amend Article 1, Section 5-(b), page 35, as follows:

"(b) Any person or persons, at his their own expense, may transport or pay the transportation costs of a prospective student-athlete to visit the campus of a member institution one time. provided such person, at his own expense, accompanies the prospective student-athlete on his visit. Only actual round-trip transportation costs by direct route between the student-athlete's home and the institution's campus may be provided. Such visit shall not exceed forty-eight hours. Requirements of O.I. 108 shall be met in all such instances."

D. Amend O.I. 115, following Bylaw 1-5-(i), page 37, as follows:

"O.I. 115. If an institution is to pay the transportation costs of a prospective student-athlete to visit the campus are paid, the visit actually must be made to the campus and not, for example, to some off-campus site where the institution happens to be appearing in an athletic contest at the particular time. The provisions of O.I. 108 shall apply in cases where costs are provided by non-institutional funds."

E. Amend O.I. 118, following Bylaw 1-5-(i), pages 37-38, as follows:

"O.I. 118. Whenever an aircraft (other than a commercial airplane or one owned personally by one individual) is used to transport a prospective student-athlete, payment for its use must be at the established charter rates at the airport where the craft is based, and the institution must be prepared to demonstrate satisfactorily that such payment has been made the provisions of O.I. 108 shall apply."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit representatives of athletic interests to provide the transportation or cost of transportation for the one permissible expense-paid campus visit, in accordance with Bylaw 1-5 and O.I. 107-(a)-(3); further, to require and provide a procedure

for institutional accountability of transportation provided by a source other than the institution, including all types of aircraft.

Effective Date: August 1, 1975.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote (also see No. 155).

NO. 98 RECRUITING—TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 126, following Bylaw 1-5-(i), page 38, and renumber subsequent O.I.'s, as follows:

"O.I. 126. It is permissible for an institution to provide local transportation between its campus and the airport nearest the campus for the parents or relatives of a prospective student-athlete making his official visit to that campus."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To permit a member institution to provide the specified transportation for a prospect's parents or relatives in connection with his one permissible expense-paid campus visit.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 99 TRYOUT EXCEPTIONS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 111, following Bylaw 1-3, page 34, by adding a new paragraph (d), as follows:

"(d) The use of an institution's facilities for physical activities by a group involving prospective student-athletes, provided the institution's athletic department staff members or representatives of its athletic interests are not involved in the conduct, supervision, promotion or administration of the activity and the activity is approved by the NCAA Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Recruiting).

Intent: To provide the means of granting an additional exception to the provisions of Bylaw 1-3 (tryout rule).

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 100 TRYOUT EXCEPTIONS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 111, following Bylaw 1-3, page 34, by adding a new paragraph (e), as follows:

"(e) The participation of an institution's athletic department staff member in recognized regional, national or international training programs or competition, provided his participation is approved by the NCAA Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Recruiting).

Intent: To provide the means of granting an additional exception to the provisions of Bylaw 1-3 (tryout rule).

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 101 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 4, page 35, as follows:

"Section 4. High School All-Star Games. No member institution shall permit any employee to participate, directly or in-

directly, in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player selection of any all-star team or contest in football or basketball involving interscholastic players or those who, during the previous school year, were members of high school teams. Facilities of a member institution shall not be made available unless such a contest is first sanctioned by the appropriate state high school athletic association or, if interstate, by the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, or by the NCAA Committee on All-Star High School Games in accordance with Constitution 3-9-(b)."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Recruiting).

Intent: To include the NCAA Committee on All-Star High School Games as a sanctioning authority for purposes of this legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 102 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 4, page 35, as follows:

"Section 4. High School All-Star Games. No member institution shall permit any employee athletic department staff member to participate, directly or indirectly, in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player selection of any all-star team or contest in football or basketball involving interscholastic players or those who, during the previous school year, were members of high school teams. Facilities of a member institution shall not be made available unless such a contest is first sanctioned by the appropriate state high school athletic association or, if interstate, by the National Federation of State High School Associations."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Recruiting).

Intent: To apply NCAA legislation regarding high school all-star games to all sports recognized by the NCAA and to clarify that the proscription against the member institution's involvement in such contests applies only to athletic department staff members, rather than to any employee of the institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 156) by all three divisions by single voice vote (also see No. 161).

NO. 103 RULES COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 4-(a)-(1), page 74, as follows:

"(1) It shall be the duty of the above committees to establish and maintain rules of play in their respective sports consistent with sound traditions of these sports and of such character as to ensure good sportsmanship and safe participation by the competitors. These playing rules shall be common for all divisions of the Association and differences among the divisions shall not be permitted. It also shall be the duty of the committees in sports for which national records are maintained to approve such records. The Council may authorize any rules committee to cooperate with other national organizations in the development of common playing rules."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prevent the establishment of different playing rules for different divisions in any sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote (also see No. 157).

NO. 104 FOOTBALL RULES COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 4-(e), pages 75-76, by adding a new paragraph (6), as follows:

"(6) The Committee shall develop rules in the sport of football for Division I members which limit the number of substitutes either team may enter the game between downs to the end that two-platoon football, as practiced under the substitution rule of 1974, shall be eliminated effective with the 1975 football season."

Source: University of Oregon.

Intent: To abolish the unlimited substitution rule that governed the sport of football in the 1974 season and direct the Football Rules Committee to develop a substitution rule similar to that which prevailed during the 1962 football season, the resultant rule to be effective for the 1975 football season.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 105 TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 2-(r), page 72, as follows:

"(r) The Television Committee shall consist of eight representatives from Division I, one representative at-large from Division II, the chairman of the Division II Football Committee and the chairman of the Division III Football Committee. One Division I representative shall be elected from each of the eight NCAA districts. The Committee shall be responsible for the formulation and administration of the Association's football television policy and program, subject to the approval of the membership, and for administration of NCAA television programs in other sports, subject to approval by the membership and direction of the Council, and the Executive Committee if NCAA championship events are concerned."

Source: NCAA Council (Television Committee).

Intent: To establish district representation on the Television Committee and to broaden its authority to include sports other than football, subject to the approval of the membership and control of the Council and/or Executive Committee.

Action: Motion to consider last sentence separately approved by voice vote. First two sentences approved by all three divisions by single voice vote. Last sentence defeated by voice vote.

NO. 106 ICE HOCKEY COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 4-(g), page 76, as follows:

"(g) The Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of six mem-

bers, one of whom shall represent secondary school ice hockey interests, and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) At least two representatives from each of the following geographical regions representing Division I: (a) The East, comprised of Districts One and Two, and (b) The West, comprised of Districts Four, Five, Seven and Eight;

"(2) One member representing Division II or III, selected alternately from the East and West geographic regions, and

"(3) One member who shall represent secondary school ice hockey interests.

"(4) The chairman may designate a secretary-rules editor from among the membership of the Committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Ice Hockey Committee).

Intent: To establish geographic and divisional requirements for membership on the NCAA Ice Hockey Committee.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 107 LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 2, pages 69-71.

A. Amend Article 8, Section 2-(a)-(2), pages 69-70, as follows:

"(2) Members may be reappointed for one additional term and after three years have elapsed, a former member may be appointed to an additional term following which he may not serve further on that committee. This paragraph shall not apply to the members of the Executive Committee, Governmental Affairs Committee, Promotion Committee and the Committee on Infractions."

B. Amend Article 8, Section 2-(k), page 71, as follows:

"(k) The Legislative Governmental Affairs Committee shall be responsible for reviewing current and proposed Federal and state legislation which might affect intercollegiate athletics, and shall periodically report its findings and recommendations to the Council. Members of the Committee may be re-elected without limitation."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Committee).

Intent: To rename the Legislative Committee and remove its members from the two-term membership limitation requirement.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 108 COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Sections 1-(a)-(6), 2-(a)-(6), 4-(a)-9 and 5-(a)-(7), pages 68, 70, 74 and 79, as follows:

"Each chairman is authorized to recommend to the Council that a member be replaced if such member is not discharging his duties properly or is not attending meetings regularly. In addition, a member who is absent from two consecutive meetings without reasons approved by the Council shall automatically be removed from the committee. The Council shall have authority to remove by majority vote such member and appoint a replacement for the unexpired portion of the term."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide for automatic replacement of a committee member who is absent from two consecutive meetings without reasons approved by the Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 109 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 3-(g)-(2), page 73, as follows:

"(2) The Committee shall have at least one meeting prior to the business session of the annual Convention and may have an additional meeting prior to the Convention, at the discretion of the chairman, for the purpose of discussing vacancies, candidates and their qualifications. It shall present to the business session one or more nominees for each of vacancy among the offices of President, the eight district vice-presidents, Secretary-Treasurer and the eight vice-presidents-at-large of the Council. The Nominating Committee shall circulate requests for vice-presidential nominees to all members of each district."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Reorganization-1974).

Intent: To make mandatory the procedure in which the Nominating Committee circulates requests for nominees to all members; further, to authorize the Committee to conduct a meeting prior to the annual Convention.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 110 COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 3-(d)-(3), page 73, as follows:

"(3) The Committee shall have at least one meeting prior to the business session of the annual Convention and may have an additional meeting prior to the Convention, at the discretion of the chairman, for the purpose of discussing vacancies, candidates and their qualifications. It shall present to the business session nominees for vacancies on all sports committees as provided in Bylaw 8-4 and Bylaw 8-5, and the general committees listed in Bylaw 8-1."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Reorganization-1974).

Intent: To authorize the Committee on Committees to conduct a meeting prior to the annual Convention.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 111 ETHICAL CONDUCT

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6, page 15, by adding a new paragraph (e), as follows:

"(e) Staff members of the athletic department of a member institution shall not represent, directly or indirectly, a student-athlete in the marketing of his athletic ability or reputation to a professional sports team or organization and shall not receive compensation or gratuities of any kind, directly or indirectly, for such services."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit athletic department staff members from representing student-athletes in the marketing of the student's athletic reputation and skill.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 112 DRUG EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 2-(d), page 70, as follows:

"(d) The Drug Education Committee shall supervise the Association's drug education program. Funds at least equal to those paid by advertisers for promoting usage of the drug 'alcohol,' including malt beverages, wine and other alcoholic drinks, in the televising of football games between NCAA member institutions are to be allocated by the Association to the Drug Education Committee and expended by that Committee in its work of discouraging the use of harmful drugs, including malt beverages, wine and other alcoholic drinks."

Source: Texas Christian University, Baylor University, Samford University.

Intent: To provide the Drug Education Committee with funds equal to those expended in advertising the use of malt beverages and wine on football telecasts of NCAA member institutions to enable the Committee to discourage the public's use of products containing the drug alcohol.

Action: Motion to refer to Council and Executive Committee for further study approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 113 ADVERTISING

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 16, page 96, as follows:

"Section 16. Advertising. Association policy governing acceptable advertisers and advertising copy for game programs, broadcasts and telecasts of NCAA championships and telecasts of NCAA member institutions' football games excludes the following: alcoholic beverages (except malt beverages and wine), political organizations, feminine hygiene products and professional sports organizations or personnel. Malt beverage and wine advertising may be used without restriction in game programs consistent with the policy of the host institution; however, only two such commercials may be used in a broadcast or telecast and each must be preceded by an announcement indicating origination of the program is returning to the station's broadcasting studio."

Source: Texas Christian University, Baylor University, Samford University.

Intent: To prevent the promotion of the drug "alcohol" on NCAA football telecasts and in conjunction with NCAA championship events.

Action: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 114 RESOLUTION: TELEVISION PLAN

"Be It Resolved, that the membership of the Association direct the NCAA Television Committee to specify, in the formulation of the next NCAA Television Plan and subsequent such Plans, that the carrying network shall not permit promotions of malt beverages, wine or other alcoholic beverages at any time on any telecast authorized by such Plan."

Source: Texas Christian University, Baylor University, Samford University.

Action: Defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 115 LIMITATIONS ON CONTRACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3 by adding a new Section 4, page 48, as follows:

"Section 4. Limitations on Contracts. (a) All contracts for football games between member institutions must be limited to a period not longer than six years from the date of signing of the contract.

"(b) All contracts for basketball games between member institutions must be limited to a period not longer than three years from the date of signing of the contract.

"(c) All contracts for football or basketball games between member institutions in force at the date of adoption of this Section must be renegotiated if they extend beyond the contract durations set forth in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Section; further, the renegotiated contracts may not be signed for periods longer than six years from the date of signing of the original contract in football and three years from the date of signing of the original contract in basketball, and further, all verbal agreements may be cancelled at the discretion of either party and cannot be considered binding until a contract is agreed upon and properly executed in terms of this Section."

Source: McNeese State University.

Intent: To establish game contract limitations of six years and three years in football and basketball, respectively.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Motion to refer to Council for further study approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 116 TRADITIONAL FALL SEASON

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 301, following Bylaw 3-1-(c), page 45, as follows:

"O.I. 301. The 'traditional fall season' is the period from September 1 the last Saturday in August through the second Saturday in December."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To include the last Saturday in August in the definition of the traditional football season and to delete the term "fall."

Action: Defeated by each division by show of paddles.

NO. 117 FOOTBALL PLAYING SEASON

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(c), page 45, as follows:

"(c) The total playing schedule for any intercollegiate football team shall be limited in any one year to a maximum of eleven twelve contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition to be played during the traditional fall season exclusive of one scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided that the game be with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students, or both, and exclusive of (i) one postseason game approved by the Association's Extra Events Committee or (ii) those games played in the National Collegiate Division II and Division III Football Championships."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To increase the number of permissible football contests by one.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 118 PLAYING SEASONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a), page 45, and reletter subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[NOTE: The following proposal is applicable only to members of Division I in football.]

"Section 1. Limitation on Playing Seasons. (a) A member institution which conducted spring football practice in the preceding academic year may elect any one of the following for its first preseason practice in football in any year and shall not commence practice prior to the date so elected:

[Paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) remain unchanged.]

"(b) A member institution which did not conduct spring football practice in the preceding academic year may elect any one of the following for its first preseason practice in football in any year and shall not commence practice prior to the date so elected:

"(1) The twenty-fourth day before its first scheduled intercollegiate game; or

"(2) The twenty-seventh day before the next-to-last Saturday in September; or

"(3) That date which will permit a maximum of thirty-nine 'practice opportunities' prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate game. In determining the number of 'practice opportunities,' the same method shall apply as specified in Section 1-(a)-(3) of this Article."

Source: Southern Conference.

Intent: To permit Division I football teams to have additional preseason football practice in lieu of spring practice, under the specified conditions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 119 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), page 46, as follows:

"Section 2. Limitations on Out-of-Season Practice. (a) Post-season practice in football shall be limited to twenty sessions in a period of thirty-six calendar days (vacation and examination days excluded). The first three sessions shall be limited to non-contact conditioning drills during which no football gear or protective equipment other than headgear, shoes, jerseys and pants shall be worn."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Out-of-Season Practice).

Intent: To specify that the first three days of spring football practice must be limited to non-contact conditioning drills.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 120 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 309, following Bylaw 3-2-(a), page 47, by adding a new paragraph (4), renumbering subsequent paragraphs, and adding new paragraphs (10), (11) and (12), as follows:

"(4) Class hours shall not be longer than other regular physical education courses at the institution. If the program is not a regular physical education class, no more than three sessions per week, each session not to exceed fifty minutes, shall be conducted.

"(10) Contact and combative activities or drills of any kind (e.g., boxing, wrestling, mass basketball) shall be prohibited.

"(11) Class or activity sessions shall be conducted only in areas in which normal physical education activities courses are conducted.

"(12) Organization of participants in the class or program, as well as any activities conducted therein, based upon player position(s) or offensive and defensive units shall be prohibited."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Out-of-Season Practice).

Intent: To establish additional criteria for physical education or physical fitness classes if they are not to be construed as practice activity.

Action: Motion to consider paragraph (11) separately defeated by voice vote. No. 120 defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 121 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(d), page 41, as follows:

"(d) Game officials shall be mutually agreed upon by the competing institutions. Neutral football officiating crews shall be used, except for closed games."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Eight Conference, Big Ten Conference, Eastern College Athletic Conference, Mid-American Conference, Missouri Valley Conference, Pacific-8 Confer-

ence, Southeastern Conference, Southern Conference, Southwest Athletic Conference, Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To stipulate that the officiating crews for postseason football contests shall be assigned by conference booking offices which do not have a member of the conference participating in the contest, except for those "closed" games which annually match representatives of the same two conferences.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 122 BASKETBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(e), page 46, as follows:

"(e) The maximum number of basketball contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition shall not exceed twenty-six twenty-seven, exclusive of contests in one postseason tournament, except that two teams may participate in an experimental basketball game sponsored by the Association, with experimental factors under control of the Basketball Rules Committee, to be held at the site of the finals of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship. No postseason tournament contest shall be played after the final game of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship."

Source: Fordham University, Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To increase the number of permissible basketball contests by one.

Action: Defeated by each division: Division I, 98-114; Division II, 37-63; Division III, 22-40.

NO. 123 PERMISSIBLE PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f), page 46, as follows:

"(f) On the day before the opening of permissible practice, as specified in Bylaw 3-1-(a) and Bylaw 3-1-(d), it shall be permissible to issue equipment, have medical examinations and take squad pictures and, in the event this day falls on Sunday, it shall be permissible to utilize the day preceding that Sunday for this purpose. As an exception in basketball only, it shall be permissible to designate a single date for the taking of squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term and prior to the opening of permissible practice as specified in Bylaw 3-1-(d)."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To permit the use of a date prior to the opening of permissible basketball practice for the purpose of taking squad photographs in that sport.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 124 DIVISION III CHAMPIONSHIPS

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 3, page 62, as follows:

"The National Collegiate Division III Swimming Championships (Effective 3/1/7675)"

Source: NCAA Council and NCAA Executive Committee (Swimming Committee).

Intent: To advance the effective date of the Division III Swimming Championships from March 1, 1976, to March 1, 1975.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Division III only: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 125 AMENDMENTS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Sections 1 and 2, page 28, as follows:

"Section 1. This Constitution may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by *November 15 November 1* preceding an annual Convention or sixty days preceding a special Convention.

"Section 2. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than *December 1 November 22* before an annual Convention or forty-five days preceding a special Convention."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Sections 1 and 2, page 81, as follows:

"Section 1. These Bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by *November 15 November 1* preceding an annual Convention or sixty days preceding a special Convention.

[Subparagraphs (a) through (g) remain unchanged.]

"Section 2. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than *December 1 November 22* before an annual Convention or forty-five days preceding a special Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To advance the deadlines for receipt and circularization of proposed amendments to allow more interim time for processing of proposals.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Part A approved by voice vote. Part B approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 126 AMENDMENTS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Sections 1 and 2, page 28, as follows:

"Section 1. This Constitution may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by *November 15 November 1* preceding an annual Convention or sixty days preceding a special Convention.

"Section 2. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than *December 1 November 15* before an annual Convention or forty-five days preceding a special Convention."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Sections 1 and 2, page 81, as follows:

"Section 1. These Bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by *November 15 November 1* preceding an annual Convention or sixty days preceding a special Convention.

[Subparagraphs (a) through (g) remain unchanged.]

"Section 2. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than *December 1 November 15* before an annual Convention or forty-five days preceding a special Convention."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To advance the deadlines for receipt and circularization of proposed amendments and to assure earlier receipt of the circularization by the membership.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 127 AMENDMENTS TO AMENDMENTS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 7, Section 3, page 28, as follows:

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the Constitution may be amended at a Convention by a majority of the members present and voting provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the *modification obligations upon member institutions* of the constitutional provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to one o'clock in the afternoon on the day preceding the final business session. The Secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business session."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 3, page 82, as follows:

"Section 3. A proposed amendment to the Bylaws may be amended at a Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the *modification obligations upon member institutions* of the bylaw provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to one o'clock in the afternoon on the day preceding the final business session. The Secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business session."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To clarify for the membership that an amendment offered at a Convention to a proposed amendment printed and distributed prior to that Convention may not impose a greater burden on the member institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Motion to refer to Council for clarification approved by voice vote.

Appendix B

69th ANNUAL CONVENTION

REVISIONS OF EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS

[The Association's Executive Committee is empowered by the Constitution to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution or the Bylaws. Following are the revisions of the Executive Regulations as adopted by the Executive Committee during 1974. Those letters and words which have been deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which have been added appear in **bold face**. Page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1974-75 NCAA Manual.]

[Note: An additional proposed revision of the Executive Regulations has been classified with similar subject matter and appears as Proposal No. 113.]

NO. 128 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 2-(b), page 87, as follows:

"(b) Division II and Division III institutions may enter student-athletes in National Collegiate Championship meets and tournaments provided the institution and individuals meet the prevailing eligibility requirements and the following individual criteria of successful performance in the particular Division II or Division III Championships:

"(1) Cross Country—first six finishers in Division II and first four finishers in Division III;

"(2) Golf—first six four in medal play (including ties) in Division II and first two in medal play (including ties) in Division III;

"(3) Gymnastics—first two in each event and first two in all-around competition in Division II;

"(4) Swimming—first six four in each Division II event and first two in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the Swimming Committee;

"(5) Tennis—first eight singles players and first eight doubles teams in Division II;

"(6) Outdoor Track—first four in each Division II event and first two in each Division III event, provided they meet the minimum performance standards established by the Track and Field Committee;

"(7) Wrestling—first two three in each weight classification in Division II and champion in each weight classification in Division III."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To establish the number of student-athletes from Division II and Division III Golf and Swimming Championships who may qualify to compete in the Division I Championships.

[Note: Subparagraph (4) will become effective only if the membership adopts Proposal No. 124.]

Action: Not challenged.

NO. 129 INELIGIBLE PARTICIPATION

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 2-(e), page 88, as follows:

"(e) When an ineligible student-athlete participates in an NCAA championship and he or the institution knew or had reason to know of his ineligibility, or a penalty has been imposed as set forth in Section 7-(a)-(11) of the NCAA enforcement program, ninety per cent or all except one unit of the institution's share of net receipts from such competition in excess of the regular expense reimbursement and any amount paid to an allied member under the rules of such allied member shall be withheld by the NCAA executive director or, if said funds have been distributed, the institution shall be required to return ninety per cent or all except one unit of its share of net receipts from such competition in excess of the regular expense reimbursement and any amount paid to an allied member under the rules of such allied member. The term 'allied member' has the meaning given to it in Constitution 4-3-(b)."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Intent: To avoid penalizing an institution twice by requiring it to return net receipts that have already been sent, or are required to be sent, to the allied member (i.e., its conference).

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

NO. 130 CHAMPIONSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 4, page 89, by deleting the present paragraph (e) and substituting the following:

"(e) An institution may enter a student-athlete or a team in an NCAA championship of the sport which is administered and supervised by the institution's department of intercollegiate athletics as a varsity activity or by another institutional department which sponsors and supervises athletic activities for undergraduate students. In either case, the students involved must meet all eligibility standards for championship competition in the institution's division, as well as those specified in NCAA Bylaw 4. Compliance with these criteria shall be certified on the official entry by the institution's faculty athletic representative."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To enable the entry of qualified students in championship events in sports which are not sponsored by the entering institution's department of intercollegiate athletics.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

NO. 131 AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2 by adding a new Section 5, renumbering subsequent sections, page 89, as follows:

"Section 5. Automatic Qualification. (a) Sports committees may recommend that a conference receive automatic qualification for teams or athletes into NCAA meets or tournaments provided the conference:

- "(1) Is an allied member of the Association;**
 - "(2) Is composed of at least six members which sponsor the sport in the division in which automatic qualification is sought;**
 - "(3) Conducts conference competition in the sport in question;**
 - "(4) Conducts its regular-season competition under eligibility rules at least as stringent as those of NCAA Bylaw 4;**
 - "(5) Competition in the applicable sport is of sufficient quality to warrant automatic qualification, and**
 - "(6) Member institutions agree to participate in the appropriate NCAA championship unless an institution or an individual athlete elects not to participate in any postseason competition in that sport.**
- "(b) In the event of a tie for the conference championship, the conference shall have the responsibility of determining which team or individual shall represent the conference in NCAA competition. If a playoff is held, such competition shall be considered conference competition, not NCAA competition.**
- "(c) Each sports committee shall recommend annually to the Executive Committee those conferences which should receive automatic qualification. The decision of the Executive Committee in each sport shall be final.**
- "(d) 'Conference competition' is defined as regular-season, round-robin type play among members of the conference, or a postseason meet or tournament designed to determine the conference's champion and representative in NCAA competition."**

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To establish criteria for determining automatic qualification for NCAA meets and tournaments.

Action: Not challenged.

NO. 132 BUDGETS AND DEFICITS

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 10, by adding a new paragraph (c), page 95, as follows:

"(c) The executive director may grant exceptions to the approved expense budget of a host institution, except in the area of entertainment, provided it can be demonstrated that the cause for the request was beyond the institution's control."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To permit exceptions as indicated to approved expense budgets.

Action: Not challenged.

NO. 133 DESIGNATION OF SITES

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 12-(a), page 95, as follows:

"(a) NCAA championship competition shall be held on the grounds or in the buildings of educational institutions whenever possible.

"(1) In those instances when it is necessary to conduct such competition at other sites, the host institution(s) shall have complete control, supervision and management of the facility being used.

"(2) In team championships, a sports committee must receive approval in advance from the NCAA Officers or Executive Committee in order to conduct a tournament or game at a site other than on the campus of one of the competing institutions."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To require approval of NCAA Officers or Executive Committee prior to conduct of an NCAA event at a neutral site.

Action: Not challenged.

NO. 134 COMMITTEE EXPENSES

Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 3, Section 2, by deleting paragraph (c), page 98, and substituting the following:

"(c) The following procedures shall be observed by chairmen of standing or special committees of the Association in obtaining approval of a meeting site:

"(1) Site recommendations shall be submitted by the committee chairmen to the NCAA national office.

"(2) The executive director shall determine the cost of commercial transportation for the committee members to the site, and he also shall determine whether there is a practical alternate site for that particular committee's meeting which would result in lower transportation costs.

"(3) A committee may not expend more than fifteen per cent over the transportation cost required to meet at the least expensive site.

"(4) The yearly expenditure of a committee which meets more than once a year may not exceed the fifteen per cent limit when applied to the total number of meetings that year."

[Note: The Executive Committee has authorized the Baseball, Basketball, Soccer and Track and Field Committees to meet at the sites of their respective Division I Championships.]

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (NCAA Energy Committee).

Intent: To extend one of the Association's energy-saving policies on a permanent basis as an inflation-fighting economy.

Action: Not challenged.

Appendix C

69th ANNUAL CONVENTION

RESOLUTION

NO. 135 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

[NOTE: The following resolution is applicable only to members of Division I.]

"Whereas, a current regulation governing the conduct of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship is that: 'Any institution which desires to host a regional tournament must agree its team will participate only in the National Collegiate Basketball Championship following conclusion of its regular season of competition;' and

"Whereas, this present policy creates great hardship on the student-athletes of an institution's basketball team that may qualify for a tournament other than the National Collegiate Basketball Championship by denying them a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to participate in a postseason tournament; and

"Whereas, by denying these student-athletes the opportunity to participate, their institution's athletic program is deprived of justified revenue, great exposure and significant publicity; and

"Whereas, there is no conclusive evidence that the participation of a host institution's basketball team in a tournament other than an NCAA regional tournament will in any way deny the regional tournament of administrative expertise or detract from its ticket revenue and media coverage; and

"Whereas, because of this current policy, many NCAA member institutions with excellent basketball facilities are refusing to bid for NCAA regional tournaments, thus, in effect, forcing such tournaments off-campus; and

"Whereas, the NCAA Division I Basketball Committee, which is charged with the responsibility of developing policies and procedures governing the administration and conduct of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship, has recommended to the NCAA Executive Committee that current policy be changed to permit a host institution to participate in another tournament, provided that such host institution agrees that its key administrative personnel will be made available for the administration and conduct of the NCAA regional tournament; and

"Whereas, the Executive Committee has declined to accept this recommendation of the Division I Basketball Committee;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Division I membership of the National Collegiate Athletic Association recommend to the Executive Committee that it reconsider and accept the recommendation of the Division I Basketball Committee."

Source: Western Athletic Conference, Big Eight Conference, Eastern College Athletic Conference, Mid-American Conference, Missouri Valley Conference, Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order in that Resolutions are not subject to divisional voting.

Appendix D

69th ANNUAL CONVENTION

AMENDMENTS TO AMENDMENTS AND OTHER PROPOSALS

NOTE: The following amendments to amendments and other proposals were presented at the 69th annual Convention. In the amendments to amendments, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted; and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer either to preceding pages containing proposals which were considered by the Convention or pages in the 1974-75 NCAA Manual.

NO. 136 AMATEURISM—ICE HOCKEY

Constitution: Amend O.I. 1, following Constitution 3-1-(a)-(3), page 6 (1974-75 NCAA Manual), by adding a new paragraph (b), as follows:

"(b) If prior to his matriculation a student-athlete has lived away from his parents' home while participating on an organized ice hockey team, the following payments by the organized ice hockey team on his behalf are permissible and shall not render the student-athlete ineligible: (i) payments made by the organized ice hockey team directly to the player's landlord for reasonable room and board expenses not in excess of thirty dollars per week, and (ii) tuition payments made by the organized ice hockey team directly to local school authorities on behalf of the player."

Source: Boston University.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 1. Motion to overturn ruling of parliamentarian defeated by show of paddles.

NO. 137 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 11, page A-5, as follows:

"(1) Actual and necessary expenses on intercollegiate athletic trips (including reasonable trips to practice sites other than those of the institution), or to transport a team a reasonable distance (approximately one hundred miles) to an off-campus site for a postseason team award or recognition meeting, or if provided for in the Bylaws the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the wife of a student-athlete in accompanying him to a certified postseason football game or an NCAA championship in the sport of football in which the student-athlete is certified eligible to participate."

Source: Big Eight Conference, Big Ten Conference, Pacific-8 Conference, Southeastern Conference, Southwest Athletic Conference, Western Athletic Conference.

Action: Approved, 154-130.

NO. 138 ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 14, page A-6, as follows:

"Section 6. Individual Certification of Compliance. In addition to meeting the eligibility requirements specified in Bylaw 4-1, all participants in a National Collegiate Athletic Association championship must sign an affidavit certifying compliance with the amateur standing provisions of Constitution 3-1. This requirement shall be administered by the chairman of the games committee, and all affidavits shall be taken on a form prescribed by each institution within one week of the particular championship in accordance with a format to be specified by the NCAA Executive Committee."

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 139 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 18, page A-8, as follows:

"O.I. 15. The phrases 'good academic standing' and 'satisfactory progress' are to be interpreted at each member institution by the academic authorities who determine the meaning of such phrases for all students, subject to the controlling legislation by the conference or similar association of which the institution is a member.

"(a) At a minimum, 'satisfactory progress' shall require a student-athlete to complete satisfactorily a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit, or in the case of an institution which awards academic credit on a system other than a semester or quarter basis, complete at least a minimum of 20 per cent of the academic units required for a baccalaureate degree, at the member institution prior to the beginning of the academic year (fall term) in which he competes. Such hours must be completed after the start of the fall term for the previous academic year in which he was in regular attendance.

"(b) Credits earned in summer school, night school and/or extension courses which are accepted by the member institution in which the student-athlete is enrolled may be counted in fulfillment of the credit hour or unit requirement provided these credits are satisfactorily completed during the twelve calendar months preceding the fall term of the academic year in question.

"(c) A student-athlete who, after initial attendance at a member institution, does not meet the requirements of the progress rules by reason of absence from school (either the member or other collegiate institution) during the regular academic year, may be nonetheless eligible for competition if adequate progress is shown by calculation made as of the beginning of the academic period of renewed attendance in the member institution, excluding the academic periods of absence, and the following conditions have been met:

"(1) The absence from school was caused by verifiable per-

sonal reasons and not motivated by intention to circumvent the purposes of the progress rules;

"(2) During the absence from school, the student-athlete did not engage in such outside competition as would have caused ineligibility during enrollment;

"(3) The student-athlete was eligible for enrollment during the absence from school;

"(4) The student-athlete has otherwise satisfied the progress requirements in the last two semesters or three quarters of enrollment during regular academic years, and

"(5) A petition for eligibility is approved by a committee designated by the NCAA Council."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

NO. 140 2.000 RULE

Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 409, page 55 (1974-75 NCAA Manual), as follows:

"O.I. 409. If a high school or preparatory school will not provide a student-athlete's grade point average or convert it to the 4.000 scale, a member institution may submit the individual's high school or preparatory school transcript to the NCAA Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements for certification or conversion. Thereafter, the grade point average shall be simultaneously circulated to all member institutions."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Motion to consider first sentence and second sentence separately approved by voice vote. First sentence approved by each division by show of paddles. Second sentence defeated by each division by show of paddles.

NO. 141 CONVERSION TO 4.000

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 25, page A-12, to alter Appellant's statement as follows:

Appellant: Mid-American Conference. Appellant proposes answer be changed from "no" to "yes." If the school will not provide a converted grade point average to the 4.000 scale or certify the student's grade point average, the college registrar may convert the grade point average using the NCAA standardized table for secondary school 2.000 conversion of other grading systems to the 4.000 scale.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 140.

NO. 142 TRANSFER RULE

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 26, page A-13, as follows:

"(d) He must, after transfer from another four-year collegiate institution, have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution, except that these provisions shall not apply to students transferring

between Division III member institutions or to Division III institutions, and provided the student had not been the recipient of financial aid based in any degree upon his athletic ability; further, provided his matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests with a view toward the student's ultimate participation in the varsity intercollegiate athletic program at either institution. The above must be as certified by the athletic directors of both institutions and the financial aids officer of the institution from which the student transferred."

Source: Fredonia State University College, University of Rochester.

Action: Division III only: Approved by show of paddles.

NO. 143 TRANSFERS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 32, page A-15, as follows:

"O.I. 402. A student shall not be considered a transfer:

[Paragraphs (a) and (b) remain unchanged.]

"(c) In a particular sport, in the instance of a student who at the certifying institution, when he:

"(1) Enrolls at a second collegiate institution, and (2) Does not practice or participate in the particular sport at the second institution, and

"(3) (2) Returns to the original certifying institution."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Action: Approved by all three divisions: Division I, voice vote; Division III, voice vote; Division II, show of paddles.

NO. 144 (NUMBER NOT UTILIZED)

NO. 145 HARDSHIP

Bylaws: The following interpretation relating to Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(1)-O.I. 400, page 50 (1974-75 NCAA Manual), appeared in the June 1, 1974, issue of the NCAA News. The member indicated asked that it be reviewed by the 69th annual Convention:

"Situation: A junior college student-athlete is injured or becomes ill as a result of his participation in intercollegiate athletics at the junior college. The injury or illness is an incapacitating condition and satisfies the requirements of 'hardship' as defined by O.I. 400. The student-athlete then transfers to an NCAA member institution.

"Question: Is it permissible for the student-athlete to obtain an additional year of eligibility as a result of his injury or illness incurred at the junior college?

"Answer: No. [Bylaw 4-1-(f)-(1)-O.I. 400]"

Appellant: Pacific Coast Athletic Association. Appellant proposes that the answer be changed from "no" to "yes" and that "hardship" provisions per O.I. 400 be applicable to participation at a junior college.

Action: Defeated by Division II, 33-56; defeated by Division I by show of paddles; approved by Division III, 41-38. [NCAA Off-

cers subsequently ruled that this was not a permissible action in that an interpretation must apply equally to all divisions if the Bylaw it interprets applies equally to all divisions.]

NO. 146 CHANGE OF DIVISION

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 53, page A-29, as follows:

"(b) The Council may, by a two-thirds vote of its members present and voting, grant exceptions to the June 1 and September 1 deadline provisions of this Section if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 147 CHANGE OF DIVISION

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 54, page A-30, as follows:

"(b) Any member institution which is transferred to a new division in any or all sports, in accordance with the provisions of this Section, must continue to be a member of that new division for a minimum of three years. The Council shall have the authority to grant exceptions to this provision, by a two-thirds vote of its members present and voting, if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such consideration."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 148 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 66, page A-36, as follows:

"(d) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless its chief executive officer certifies annually on a form and by a date approved by the NCAA Council that (1) he or his designated representative has reviewed with all athletic department staff members the rules and regulations of the Association as they apply to the administration and conduct of intercollegiate athletics; and that within the preceding three years no member of the institution's coaching staff has been found by the Committee on Infractions, the Council or the annual Convention following an official inquiry to have violated any of the principles of ethical conduct enunciated in Constitution 3-6-(a); (2) at the time of such certification (i) no current member of its coaching staff is, pursuant to the provisions of Section 7-(a)-(12) of the Official Procedure Governing the NCAA Enforcement Program and as a result of violation of the principles of ethical conduct enunciated in Constitution 3-6-(a), serving a period of debarment imposed by a member institution (which period of debarment may not exceed two years), and (ii) the coaching contract of any current member of its coaching staff has not, pursuant to the aforesaid provisions, within the immediately preceding two years been terminated by it or another member institution as a result of violation as aforesaid, provided that this subsection (2) shall not be operative

with reference to any individual member of the member institution's coaching staff whose debarment or the termination of whose coaching contract shall have been imposed without a hearing by the member institution imposing same, and shall subsequently have been expressly approved by the NCAA Committee on Infractions or the NCAA Council after further hearing pursuant to the provisions of the aforesaid Section 7-(a)-(12), notice of and opportunity to be heard at such NCAA hearing having been given to the individual in question as well as to the member institution imposing the penalty; (2) (3) the policies, procedures and practices of the institution, its staff members and representatives of athletic interests are in compliance at the present time with the Association's legislation insofar as he can determine, and (3) (4) it is the intention of the institution to maintain such compliance."

Source: Augusta College; Bloomsburg State College; Bowling Green State University; Brockport State University College; University of California, Santa Barbara; California State University, Long Beach; University of Cincinnati; Geneseo State University College; Georgia Southern College; Idaho State University; Jacksonville University; Keene State College; Lincoln University (Missouri); Marshall University; University of Montana; North Carolina Central University; Northwestern Louisiana State University; Ohio State University; South Dakota State University; Southern University (New Orleans); Southwest Missouri State University; University of Tennessee, Chattanooga; Texas Christian University; Texas Tech University; Valdosta State College.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 149 RESOLUTION: ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Whereas, the NCAA Council recognizes that oftentimes there are numerous additional actions which must be taken by a member institution found to be in violation of NCAA rules and regulations in accordance with the Association's Enforcement Procedures, and that there could be resultant requirements imposed upon the institution by NCAA rules and regulations in addition to penalties which have been levied;

Whereas, the NCAA Council realizes that a service to the NCAA member institution involved in an infractions case would be to provide a composite statement of such additional actions and requirements;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the appropriate infractions report of the Committee on Infractions and Council contain a consolidated statement of all penalties, corrective actions, requirements and other conditions and obligations of membership imposed upon a member institution found in violation of NCAA legislation;

Be It Further Resolved, that the statement of such actions shall include, but not be limited to, penalties imposed upon the institution, eligibility rules to be applied, applicable Executive Regulations, the adjustment of individual and team standings in NCAA championship events, and the request for the return of any awards and net receipts

received for participation in an NCAA championship;

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Council submit to the 70th annual Convention an amendment to the NCAA Enforcement Procedures which will incorporate the requirements of this Resolution.

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 150 COUNTABLE PLAYERS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 75-A, page A-40, as follows:

"(b) He was recruited and is receiving financial aid as set forth in O.I. 500 and engages in intercollegiate competition in that sport other than as a member of the institution's freshman team."

[Proposal B and C remain unchanged.]

Source: Ivy Group.

Action: Divisions I and II only: Approved by each division by show of paddles.

NO. 151 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 85-B, page A-44, as follows:

[Proposal No. 85-A, C and D remain unchanged.]

"Section 5. Maximum Awards. A member institution shall not make an award of financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) in excess of the number and value permitted by the following rules:

"(a) In each sport, except football and basketball, there shall be a limit on the value of the financial aid awards in effect at any one time including awards made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year and four-year institutions) and upperclassmen. Further, for all sports other than football and basketball, the value of each individual award shall not exceed tuition and fees at the awarding institution, except that student-athletes shall be allowed to earn through institutional or other employment, that amount which, when combined with the financial aid award, shall not exceed that institution's 'commonly accepted educational expenses.'"

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Action: Ruled out of order due to action on No. 85-A.

NO. 152 MAXIMUM AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 89, page A-47, as follows:

"(e) Football—Division II. For institutions desiring to be eligible for the Division II Football Championship, there shall be an annual limit on the value of initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes; further, there shall be an annual limit on the value of additional financial aid awards which may be in effect the same year. The following limitations are applicable: Fifteen maximum initial awards per year. Thirty-five maximum additional awards in effect the same year. Division II institutions in the sport of football which do not

wish to be eligible for the Division II Football Championship will be governed by the provisions of Bylaw 5-5-(c).

(Effective: 9/1/76)"

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 153 RECRUITING BENEFITS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 93, page A-49, as follows:

"O.I. 102. An institution's staff member or any other representative of an institution's athletic interests shall not, during recruitment of an individual and prior to the individual's enrollment in the institution, be involved, directly or indirectly, in making arrangements for or giving or offering to give any financial aid or other benefits to the prospective student-athlete, his relatives or friends, other than expressly permitted by governing legislation of this Association. This prohibition shall apply regardless of whether similar financial aid, benefits or arrangements are available to prospective students in general, their relatives or friends. Specifically prohibited financial aid, benefits and arrangements include, but are not limited to: employment, gift of clothing or equipment; loans other than legitimate loans based upon a regular repayment schedule, or the cosigning thereof of any loan; cash or like items; any tangible items including merchandise, free or reduced cost services or rental or purchases of any type, and free or reduced cost housing."

Source: Oregon State University.

Action: Defeated by each division by show of paddles.

NO. 154 RECRUITING CONTRACTS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 96-A, page A-50, as follows:

"(c) No athletic staff member institution, through a representative of its athletic staff or other representative of the institution's its athletic interests, shall contact a prospective student-athlete in person off campus on more than three occasions for recruiting purposes."

[Proposal No. 96-B remains unchanged.]

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 155 RECRUITING—TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 97-A, page A-50, as follows:

"Section 2. Use of Funds. (a) All funds for the recruiting of prospective student-athletes except those used by representatives of athletic interests in providing transportation to the campus for the one permissible expense-paid visit shall be deposited with the member institution which shall be exclusively and entirely responsible for the manner in which it expends the funds.

"(b) No member institution shall permit any outside organization, agency or group of individuals to utilize, administer or

expend funds for recruiting prospective student-athletes, including the entertainment of, and the giving of gifts or services to, prospective student-athletes or their relatives and friends.

"(c) The pooling of resources for such recruiting purposes by two or more persons shall constitute such a fund; except that this provision shall not apply to persons upon whom a prospective student-athlete may be naturally or legally dependent, nor to a person or persons providing only transportation for the one permissible expense-paid visit nor to resources pooled by a person or persons only for the purpose of providing transportation for the one permissible expense-paid visit."

[Proposal No. 97-B, C, D and E remain unchanged.]

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 156 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 102, page A-53, as follows:

"Section 4. High School All-Star Games. No member institution shall permit any athletic department staff member coach or any athletic department staff member directly involved in the recruiting of student-athletes to participate, directly or indirectly, in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player selection of any all-star team or contest involving interscholastic players or those who, during the previous school year, were members of high school teams. Facilities of a member institution shall not be made available unless such a contest is first sanctioned by the appropriate state high school athletic association or, if interstate, by the National Federation of State High School Associations."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 157 RULES COMMITTEES

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 103, page A-53, as follows:

"(1) It shall be the duty of the above committees to establish and maintain rules of play in their respective sports consistent with sound traditions of these sports and of such character as to ensure good sportsmanship and safe participation by the competitors. These playing rules shall be common for all divisions of the Association and differences among the divisions shall not be permitted, except as directed in the appropriate subparagraphs (b) through (n) of this Section. It also shall be the duty of the committees in sports for which national records are maintained to approve such records. The Council may authorize any rules committee to cooperate with other national organizations in the development of common playing rules."

Source: University of Oregon.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 158 RESOLUTION: CURTAILING COSTS

Whereas, the NCAA recently reorganized to enable its members to

deal more effectively with the problems of intercollegiate athletics;
Whereas, constantly rising costs of intercollegiate athletics pose a mounting threat to the existence of established intercollegiate sports, not to mention jeopardizing plans for expansion of intercollegiate opportunities;

Whereas, a study already is underway as to the length of practice and playing seasons as well as factors associated with those activities, in order to provide meaningful information upon which to base future judgments;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council be authorized to convene a select meeting of college presidents, faculty athletic representatives, athletic directors and coaches prior to the close of the current academic year for the purposes of

1. Examining ways and means of curtailing operating costs through additional limitations on financial aid awards, reduced values of individual financial aid awards, curtailment on the number of athletic department personnel employed in any one sport and curtailment of the total number of expense-paid visitations of prospective student-athletes by any one institution;
2. Developing ways and means of generating revenues so that, coupled with the savings that might be realized, intercollegiate programs can continue to be expanded instead of curtailed, including opportunities for female student-athletes, and

Be It Finally Resolved, that this meeting of select delegates be structured to accommodate the interests of the three different divisions of the Association so that divisional considerations of these problems may be accomplished within the overall conference framework.

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 159 RESOLUTION: POSTSEASON FOOTBALL GAMES

Whereas, the procedures followed in the selection of teams for certified postseason football games consistently have led to complaints by NCAA members and bowl game operators;

Whereas, the NCAA in the past has attempted to place reasonable restraints through Bylaw 2-2-(j) on the timing of such invitations as a means of obtaining fairer evaluations on the part of all parties concerned;

Whereas, these previous NCAA policies were deliberately circumvented by some bowl game operators and some member institutions, leading this Association to eliminate its previous Bylaw legislation in this area because of the lack of the necessary means of enforcement;

Whereas, the 1974 season clearly demonstrated the need for renewed efforts in this area and the inadequacies of voluntary agreements among the various bowl game operators;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the 69th NCAA Convention, under the authority of Constitution 6-4, require that until the next annual Convention of the Association, a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletic staff mem-

bers, representatives of its athletic interests or student-athletes, shall not consider any formal or informal invitations, directly or indirectly from any official or unofficial representative or agent of a postseason football game concerning the possibility of playing in a certified postseason football game prior to 6:00 p.m. local time of the third Saturday in November. A member institution which violates the provisions of this paragraph shall be prohibited from participating in any postseason football game for a minimum of two years;

Be It Further Resolved, that any official or unofficial representative or agent of a postseason football game shall not extend an invitation, either directly or indirectly, to a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletic staff members, representatives of its athletic interests or student-athletes, concerning the possibility of playing in a postseason football game prior to the above specified time. The management of the certified game which violates the provisions of this paragraph shall return to the Association 50 per cent of its share of gross receipts from the contest which were determined in accordance with Bylaw 2-2-(h) and Executive Regulation 4-1-(a), to be used in funding the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Program.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Extra Events Committee shall prepare certification documents which require the management of each postseason bowl game to enter into a contractual agreement through the NCAA certification program that provides the bowl management will abide by the provisions of this Resolution in consideration for receiving certification of its postseason bowl game following the 1975 football season.

Be It Finally Resolved, that the effectiveness of this Resolution shall be evaluated by the Extra Events Committee with a view toward submitting a Bylaw amendment to the 70th annual Convention.

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 160 (NUMBER NOT UTILIZED)

NO. 161 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 102, page A-53, as follows:

"Section 4. High School All-Star Games. No member institution shall permit any athletic department staff member excepting team physicians and athletic trainers to participate, directly or indirectly, in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player selection of any all-star team or contest involving interscholastic players or those who, during the previous school year, were members of high school teams. Facilities of a member institution shall not be made available unless such a contest is first sanctioned by the appropriate state high school athletic association or, if interstate, by the National Federation of State High School Associations."

Source: Pennsylvania State University.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 162 AMATEURISM—SUMMER EXPENSES

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 9, page A-4, as follows:

"(3) Payment of excessive or improper expense allowances, including, but not limited to, payment of (i) money to team members or individual competitors for unspecified or unitemized expenses; (ii) expenses incurred by a student-athlete which are prohibited by the rules governing an amateur non-college event in which the student-athlete participates, or (iii) expenses incurred by a student-athlete competing in an event which occurs at a time when he is not regularly enrolled in a full-time program of studies during the regular academic year, or not eligible to represent his institution, except that expenses may be paid for a student-athlete to compete only in regularly scheduled intercollegiate events and established national championships occurring between terms and during the summer months, provided he is representing his institution and was eligible for intercollegiate competition the preceding term, and in international competition approved by the NCAA Council."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 163 ELIGIBILITY RULES

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 35-B, page A-17, as follows:

"(j) He must conform to the following provisions for eligibility for competition and practice and financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree).

"(1) For entering freshmen with no previous college attendance (Division I only):

"(3)-a-2. Eligibility for aid and practice (Division I Only):

"(3)-b-1. For 2.000 achiever: To be eligible for financial aid (Division I only) and competition immediately, he must have:"
[All other paragraphs remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 164 INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 37, page A-23, as follows:

"(f) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament in a particular sport unless the institution in the conduct of that intercollegiate sport limits its scholarships, grant-in-aid awards and other financial assistance (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in competition and in organized athletic practice sessions in that sport during the first year in residence, to not more than the following number of student-athletes per year who were not, at the time of initial contact between an athletic department staff member or a representative of the athletic interests of the member institution and the student-athlete, either citizens of the United States or aliens who had been lawfully admitted to the United States: Cross

Country/Track and Field—One. Gymnastics—One. Ice Hockey—Two Three. Skiing—One. Soccer—One."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 165 RECRUITING BENEFITS

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 93, page A-49, as follows:

"O.I. 102. An institution's staff member or any other representative of an institution's athletic interests shall not, during recruitment of an individual and prior to the individual's enrollment in the institution, be involved, directly or indirectly, in making arrangements for or giving or offering to give any financial aid or other benefits to the prospective student-athlete, his relatives or friends, other than expressly permitted by governing legislation of this Association. This prohibition shall apply regardless of whether similar financial aid, benefits or arrangements are available to prospective students in general, their relatives or friends. Specifically prohibited financial aid, benefits and arrangements include, but are not limited to: employment other than as a part of the member institution's student aid program; gift of clothing or equipment; loans other than as a part of the member institution's student aid program or the cosigning thereof of any loan; cash or like items; any tangible items including merchandise, free or reduced cost services or rental or purchases of any type, and free or reduced cost housing."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Defeated by all three divisions by single voice vote.

NO. 166 RESOLUTION: BASKETBALL HALL OF FAME

Whereas, the National Association of Basketball Coaches supports the Naismith Hall of Fame; and

Whereas, the NABC, an affiliated member of the NCAA, has always been the champion of the best in democratic practices and the highest in educational ideals in basketball in the United States; and

Whereas, several of the member institutions of the NCAA, being set aside by the social and cultural patterns of the country, have come together in discussion and referral committee, known as the National Athletic Steering Committee (NASC), whose primary purpose is to make functional and perpetuate in the athletic programs of colleges which the Steering Committee represents those same high ideals delineated by the NABC and the NCAA; and

Whereas, the best of amateur basketball is played in NCAA colleges; and

Whereas, the best of amateur coaches teach and coach at NCAA colleges; and

Whereas, clinicians representing the Collegiate Commissioners Association praise the Basketball Hall of Fame; and

Whereas, the publications of the CCA, an affiliated member of the NCAA, advertise the Hall of Fame; and

Whereas, the only thing mentioned about color in the rules of

basketball is that the home team will wear the lighter colored uniforms;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the 69th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and its allied and affiliated organizations here assembled endorses this Resolution as an open letter to Lee Williams, director, and the trustees of the Naismith Hall of Fame to examine the criteria that thus far have resulted in not selecting an individual black player or coach in those categories in the Basketball Hall of Fame.

Source: Alcorn State University; Florida A&M University; Hampton Institute; Howard University; Morgan State University; Morris Brown College; Tennessee State University; Texas Southern University; University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff; Virginia State College.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 167 RESOLUTION: TICKETS

Be It Resolved, that no tickets, whether complimentary to the student-athlete or purchased by him, shall be given directly to the student-athlete.

Be It Finally Resolved, that all such tickets shall be dispersed only as follows: (1) to persons designated by the student-athlete, and who have identified themselves and signed a receipt therefor, and (2) to persons who shall receive such tickets only on the day of the contest at the ticket gate.

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

NO. 168 RESOLUTION: WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Whereas, this Association has taken an active interest in the development of women's intercollegiate athletics since 1963; and

Whereas, developments in the field of equal rights—as to legal requirements and society's needs—now pose serious demands upon the NCAA as an organization; and

Whereas, the Association's legal counsel has consistently reminded the NCAA Council that

- (1) The Association's rules and the obligations of institutional membership relate to all varsity intercollegiate sports and do not differentiate between men and women; and
- (2) the Association is facing legal obligation to offer services and programs to women student-athletes as they do for men; and

Whereas, each member institution has had these influences and requirements visited upon it at the institutional level and now the Association, itself, must move to adjust its concepts and programs to meet the demands of today's society and today's law;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council prepare a comprehensive report and plan on the several issues involved in the administration of women's intercollegiate athletics at the national level in light of existing court decisions, anticipated regulations implementing Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 and

present developments in women's intercollegiate athletics;

Be It Further Resolved, that the report and plan of the Council be circulated to all members not later than May 1, 1975, and, after soliciting and receiving the membership's comments, then the Council prepare whatever proposals it believes necessary and desirable for consideration by the 1976 NCAA Convention;

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Council include in its report whether the Council believes it would be desirable or legally necessary for national championships to be conducted by the Association for female student-athletes either on an integrated or segregated basis, and that the Council direct its Special Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics to determine if it is advisable to conduct pilot programs for women's national championships as a part of development of a final proposal for consideration by the membership, it being understood that no such pilot program shall be conducted during this academic year.

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Motion to table defeated by voice vote. Motion to consider final paragraph separately defeated by show of paddles. Motion to refer to Council defeated by voice vote. Proposal 168 defeated by voice vote.

NO. 169 RESOLUTION: WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Whereas, this Association has taken an active interest in the development of women's intercollegiate athletics since 1963; and

Whereas, developments in the field of equal rights—as to legal requirements and society's needs—now pose serious demands upon the NCAA as an organization; and

Whereas, the Association's legal counsel has consistently reminded the NCAA Council that

- (1) the Association's rules and the obligations of institutional membership relate to all varsity intercollegiate sports and do not differentiate between men and women; and
- (2) the Association is facing legal obligation to offer services and programs to women student-athletes as it does for men; and

Whereas, each member institution has had these influences and requirements visited upon it at the institutional level and now the Association, itself, must move to adjust its concepts and programs to meet the demands of today's society and today's law;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council prepare a comprehensive report and plan on the several issues involved in the administration of women's intercollegiate athletics at the national level in light of existing court decisions, anticipated regulations implementing Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 and present developments in women's intercollegiate athletics;

Be It Further Resolved, that the report and plan of the Council be circulated to all members of the NCAA and the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women not later than May 1, 1975, and, after soliciting and receiving the memberships' comments, a joint committee of both the NCAA and AIAW shall make recommenda-

tions for consideration by the Council and then the Council prepare whatever proposals it believes necessary and desirable for consideration by the 1976 NCAA Convention;

Be It Finally Resolved, that the Council include in its report whether the Council believes it would be desirable or legally necessary for national championships to be conducted by the Association for female student-athletes either on an integrated or segregated basis, and that the Council direct its Special Committee on Women's Intercollegiate Athletics to determine if it is advisable to conduct pilot programs for women's national championships as a part of development of a final proposal for consideration by the membership, it being understood that no such pilot program shall be conducted during this academic year.

Source: California State University, Long Beach.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

Appendix E

69th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Nominating Committee

Chairman—Ralph E. Fadum

District 1—Ross H. Smith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
District 2—John R. Eiler, East Stroudsburg State College
District 3—Ralph E. Fadum, North Carolina State University
District 4—William D. Rohr, Ohio University
District 5—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
District 6—Harold Jeskey, Southern Methodist University
District 7—Harry E. Troxell, Colorado State University
District 8—O. Kenneth Karr, San Diego State University
At-Large—Cecil N. Coleman, University of Illinois, Champaign
At-Large—H. Boyd McWhorter, Southeastern Conference
At-Large—John A. Pfitsch, Grinnell College
At-Large—Joe L. Singleton, University of California, Davis

Committee on Committees

Chairman—James B. Higgins

District 1—Ferdinand A. Geiger, Brown University
District 2—William P. Dioguardi, Montclair State College
District 3—Eugene F. Corrigan, University of Virginia
District 4—J. Edward Weaver, Ohio State University
District 5—Richard G. Koppenhaver, North Central Conference
District 6—James B. Higgins, Lamar University
District 7—Fritz S. Brennecke, Colorado School of Mines
District 8—Cedric W. Dempsey, University of the Pacific
At-Large—Edwin B. Crowder, University of Colorado
At-Large—Capt. Otto Graham, U.S. Coast Guard Academy
At-Large—George H. Hobson, Alabama A&M University
At-Large—Vannette W. Johnson, University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff

Committee on Voting

Chairman—H. Boyd McWhorter

District 1—Russ Granger, Clark University
District 2—David B. Eavenson, Dickinson College
District 3—Richard T. Bowers, University of South Florida
District 4—Leo VanderBeek, Western Michigan University
District 5—Aldo A. Sebben, Southwest Missouri State University
District 6—Marino H. Casem, Alcorn State University
District 7—Fritz S. Brennecke, Colorado School of Mines
District 8—Donald Warhurst, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
At-Large—H. Boyd McWhorter, Southeastern Conference

Committee on Memorial Resolutions

Chairman—Robert H. Frailey
Robert H. Frailey, American University
Ronald D. Roberts, Lawrence University
Joe L. Singleton, University of California, Davis

Committee on Credentials

Chairman—H. Evan Zeiger
Ralph H. Coleman, University of Evansville
Vannette W. Johnson, University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff
H. Evan Zeiger, Samford University

Parliamentarian

Harry M. Cross, University of Washington

Chairman of Business Sessions

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

Chairman of Combined Round Table

Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University

Appendix F

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President

1906-1913 Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1914-1916 LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929 Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1930-1932 Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937 Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1938-1940 William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944 Philip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946 Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949 Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa
1950-1952 Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954 Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama
1955-1956 Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958 Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960 Herbert J. Dorricott, Western Colorado State College
1961-1962 Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964 Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966 Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968 Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969-1970 Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
1971-1972 Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee
1973-1974 Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
1975- John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University

Secretary-Treasurer

*1906-1908 Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University
*1908 William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
1909-1939 Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944 Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1945-1951 Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
1952-1954 Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
1955-1956 Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958 Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960 Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962 Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964 Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966 Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968 Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969-1970 William J. Flynn, Boston College
1971-1972 Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, District of Columbia Teachers College
1973-1974 Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
1975- Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University

*Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

Appendix G

NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1975

(Hotels in parentheses.)

*38th	1944	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)

*NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943 and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January.

1976 Convention

Stouffer's Riverfront Inn, St. Louis, Missouri, January 14-16

1977 Convention

Diplomat Hotel, Hollywood, Florida, January 14-20

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



INCA00003105M

00

0

